

THE
BOSTON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

JULY, 1839.

ART. I. — BULWER'S NOVELS. — *Their Moral Tendency
not dangerous.*

IN a short notice which we took, sometime since, of "Ernest Maltravers," we stated that, on the appearance of the sequel to that work, we would attempt to form an estimate of the general merits of Mr. Bulwer as an author and a novelist. We proceed now to redeem our promise; and we do it the more willingly, because we entertain a more favorable opinion of his literary productions than that entertained by several of our contemporaries.

Of Mr. Bulwer's private character we know only what we can infer from his works. Some reports to his prejudice have reached us; but we have lived too long to be in haste to credit reports against an author, who apparently speaks from his own convictions, and, to a certain extent at least, makes war upon commonly received opinions and conventional usages. The good we hear of such an author it is safe to believe, but not the evil. The necessity he imposes upon the men of routine, the good easy men of the world, of vindicating their traditionary creeds, and legitimating their

blind practices, readily accounts for the stories which may be told against him, without the gratuitous supposition of their truth.

Mr. Bulwer, like most men of vigor and activity of mind enough to form opinions for themselves, is somewhat of a heretic, and, therefore, inevitably exposed to the universal fate of heretics — misconception and misrepresentation. Still, a knowledge of his private history is not essential to the just estimation of his books. Books, if worth considering at all, have a character independent of that of their author. Truth is truth, by whomsoever uttered ; and a good moral lesson does not necessarily lose its savor because he who gives it may, perchance, turn out to be no saint. The worth of a book consists in the spirit it breathes, the lesson it inculcates, the influence it is fitted to exert ; and if these be unexceptionable in themselves, the character of the author, whatever it may be, cannot impair their value.

Moreover, if these be unexceptionable, the real character of the author cannot be very reprehensible. If the book breathe a pure and elevating spirit, quicken our holier instincts, and fire us with new zeal and courage to attempt a useful and honorable part in life, no biographer in the world, let his array of facts be what it may, can make us believe the author was not a frequent and devout worshipper at the shrine of Virtue. A man's outward actions are but his shadows, shortening or lengthening as the sun rises or declines ; they are determined, to a great extent, by foreign influences, over which he has no control, and, therefore, are no sure index to his real character. His real character lies beneath the surface, consists in his internal workings, his hopes, fears, struggles, aims, aspirations, ideals, and these the author invariably stamps upon his book.

Nor does it comport with our ideas of consistency to condemn Mr. Bulwer's works merely on the ground of the alleged sins of their author, so long as we approve the works of other authors, who are at least no better

than he is said to be. Scott would hardly come off clear, if tried by rigid orthodox rules ; and yet it is lawful to read and laud his productions. Even clergymen read them, and recommend them from the pulpit. Goethe, too, is in tolerable repute. Pious young ladies write his biography, and, with charming *naïveté*, ask for more information concerning his marriage. And yet Goethe was but an indifferent saint. He was a confirmed sensualist, and a disbeliever in nearly all that the world upholds as religion. He held him to be the truly wise man who needed no assistance from God or the devil in the conduct of life ; and he considered it nobody's business how many of the young and beautiful he seduced and abandoned to infamy, wretchedness, despair, and death, if he but succeeded in " acting out himself," and securing his own gratification. Surely, if we regard such a man as Goethe as a religious man, as a sort of second Messiah, as some among us do, we ought not to be very loud in our condemnation of Sir Edward Lytton Bulwer.

But, waiving the personal character of the author, we proceed at once to his works. These are his best biographies, and these are all that concern us. Through these he exerts an influence on this country, for good or for evil, and of these, therefore, instead of him, we should seek to form a correct estimate.

As mere works of Art, we have not much to say of Mr. Bulwer's novels. We are neither artists, nor qualified to judge of the niceties of art. We know when and why a work pleases us, but not whether the artist has observed all the rules of the schools or not, whether we are pleased according to rule, or against rule. We love art in all its branches ; but we approve no work, whatever artistical skill it may display, unless its moral tendency be unexceptionable. Genius and talent are to us worthy of reverence only when employed in a holy cause, and directed to noble ends. Moreover, we are in the habit of questioning the artistical merit of all works which have an immoral tendency. A work of art, it strikes us, should be addressed to man's whole nature,

and so fill the soul, that no want shall be felt in its presence. The moral sense is an integral element of the soul, and how, then, can a work possess artistical perfection, which does not satisfy our moral sense, or rather, which outrages it? Such a work is marked by a serious defect; it leaves the beholder conscious of a want it does not meet. It is not broad enough for the soul, and it proves its author must have been only the fraction of a man.

Let it not, however, be inferred from this, that we would have every work of art constructed with express reference to some special dogma, or to some special moral lesson. We have no great respect for what are usually termed religious novels, of which "Thornton Abbey," "Cœlebs in Search of a Wife," "Dunallen," "The Lady of the Manor," are tolerable specimens. They are to us very uninteresting productions; we seldom read more of them than we can help. Whoever undertakes to write a work for the express purpose of conveying a special lesson, a special moral, almost invariably fetters his genius, abandons his natural freedom, and with it all grace of motion. His movements become stiff, constrained, and awkward. Be the cravings of nature what they may, all things must bend to the special moral to be brought out, and that moral, too, is everywhere before us, meeting us at every turn. It is *toujours perdrix*,—a good dish, no doubt, but, like all good dishes, apt to cloy if served up too often, both in season and out of season. Such a proceeding is also unnatural, for Nature nowhere teaches a special moral, but merely makes her various productions conspire to a moral end. It must, too, in general, be a failure. The offspring, if they come to anything at all, which they rarely do, are the huge, ill-shapen beasts of Oriental mythology, not the chaste, harmonious, and graceful creations of Grecian genius. All we ask of the artist, and this we do ask of him, is that he create with a moral purpose, with reference to a moral effect. The love of moral Beauty must fill his soul, inspire his undertaking, and pervade his

works as an informing spirit. His productions will then have a moral effect, a moral tendency, though there be no special moral tacked on to the end, as in *Æsop's Fables*.

With this view of Art, we must, if we are not mistaken, deny the highest artistic merit to such a writer, for example, as Goethe. We speak with reserve of this distinguished German, for we know him mainly through the representations of others, never having studied his works for ourselves. But so far as we can form an estimate of him from the representations of his professed admirers, we regard him as deficient on the moral side of art. He was not without a sort of reverential feeling for nature, and perhaps for some of the household virtues so common to the Germans ; but we never find him creating at the command of high moral instincts. He does not appear to work because his soul is full of love to God and man, and because he feels that all the faculties God has given him should be consecrated to the service of his race. We find in him no pure love of Humanity, no unquenchable thirst for a purer and better social state, no throbbing of the heart, no intense longing to stand by the weak, to raise up the low, and bring down the high. Nothing of all this wells up from the depths of his soul, and streams out in the rich melodies of his song. He sings to ease himself, to permit the effervescence of passion to escape, and to recover self-possession for the enjoyment of his pleasures. His songs do not kindle us, exalt us, enlarge our ideals, and make us stronger and more courageous in the cause of virtue ; and, therefore, in our judgment, fall short of the highest artistical merit.

On the same ground, too, we must question the high artistical merit of Sir Walter Scott. Scott's works, bepraised as they have been and are, have never satisfied us as moral productions. Nor does he himself come up to our ideal of a moral man. He has no remarkable love of moral beauty, and no abiding sense of his duty to devote his gifts to the good of mankind.

No picture of high moral excellence has ever come forth from his studio. His loftiest ideals are but one degree above the common-place, and never does he address his works to the higher elements of the human soul. His characters, it is true, are chiefly taken from actual life, and this may in part excuse him; but he does not select the best which even actual life could furnish. He never selects the real heroes or seers of Humanity, nor attempts the portrait of a man of high aspirings, of lofty aims, haunted day and night by visions of a greater good to be wrought out for his country or for his race, and which will not let him rest till he has done all in his power to realize them. There are no Wat Tylers, Jack Cades, Van Arteveldts, Rienzis, Sydneys, Hampdens, Vanes, Miltons, among his offspring. The creator of the Dalgetties, the Marmions, the Quentin Durwards, the Fairservices, the Varneys, and the Ned Christians, had no fellowship with these stern lovers of justice, who lived but to resist the tyrant, to lighten the load of the heavy laden, and to enable the oppressed to stand up in the image of their Maker, and look forth in joy upon a world made beautiful by the presence of Universal Love. He beheld no beauty or comeliness in them that he should desire them, or point them out to the love and reverence of mankind.

True morality is somewhat higher than Scott was in the habit of looking. It is not merely respectability, decency, good feeling, hospitality, vulgar loyalty, and the absence of envy as an author; nor does it stop merely with what are termed the private and domestic virtues. It goes out of self, out of the family circle, and embraces universal man. Pure in motive, lofty in purpose, firm in resolve, it espouses the cause of the weak, takes its stand with the wronged, shelters the friendless, speaks for the dumb, raises up the down-trodden, deposes the tyrant, unbars the prison-door, recalls the exile, and establishes the reign of Justice and Freedom throughout the earth. Works, which reveal to us nothing of this Christian morality, which

kindle in us no desire to possess it, nor strengthen us to do its bidding, are not merely defective in a moral point of view, but also in an artistical point of view. They fail in accomplishing the legitimate purposes of art. In the works of the old masters, unless we have been misinformed, there are proofs that the artist has communed with a beauty, a worth, not of this world. The study of those works tends to enlarge our ideals, to give us glimpses of something purer and more elevated than has yet been attained, to exalt our sentiments, to purify our affections, to create in us inexpressible longings for what we have not, and to make us consecrate ourselves to the glorious work of regenerating the world. This should be the tendency and aim of Art. Do we perceive anything of this aim and this tendency in the writings of Sir Walter Scott? Is he true to that higher morality, the possession of which makes us brothers of Jesus and sons of God? Not at all. The perusal of his works has no tendency to make us wiser or better; it furnishes us no food for reflection; clears up no dark passage in human life or in human nature; and does nothing to kindle within us that philanthropy which would do and dare anything and everything to augment the sum of human well-being. In these works, the ordinary is made to suffice us; and we are taught, virtually, that if we have an old baronial castle, a long pedigree, some pieces of old armor to hang up in the hall, a fine horse, and choice hounds for the chase, old books, and plenty of old wine for convivial parties, and in which to pledge the king and some "faire ladie," we need be under no apprehension for this world, nor for that which is to come.

Now, we are far from pretending that Mr. Bulwer satisfies us on this moral side of Art; we are free to own that he does not realize our ideal, but he does it more fully than the majority of popular authors with whom we are conversant. He seems to us to write with a moral purpose, seriously and honestly, for a moral end. He always seems to us earnestly

enlisted on the side of Humanity, and firmly resolved that his works shall not only be amusing, but instructive, kindling our moral instincts, and disposing us to make our lives worth something to the world. If so, we must acquit him, in a moral point of view, at least so far as aims are in question; nay, we must honor him.

But we shall, probably, be told, that the morality, he actually inculcates, is of a low and debasing sort. We have been so told till we are weary of hearing it. Honor to the brave old Athenian who ostracised Aristides because he was tired of hearing him called the just! We sympathize most heartily with his feeling; and, applying it to the opposite case, we can never hear a man perpetually called immoral, but we have an invincible inclination to maintain that he is moral. Let the odds be against a man, and he may call us his friend, and count upon our taking up the cudgels in his behalf. Since the world has turned against our friend Emerson, and set to praising a feeble, though well-meant, performance, in the shape of a Sermon on the Personality of the Deity, supposed to be directed against him, we heartily repent of having appeared among his opponents. We were as much out of our place as Saul was among the prophets. Heavens! only think of the Boston Quarterly Review joining with grave doctors and learned professors to write down a man who has the boldness to speak from his own convictions, from his own free soul! It was a great mistake on our part, and one which, alas! we perceived not till it was too late. Honor to every man who speaks from his own mind, whatever be his word. He is an Iconoclast, a servant of the true God, even though it be a left-handed one.

Now as to this declamation against the immoral tendency of Mr. Bulwer's novels, let it be observed that it proceeds mainly from the scribes and pharisees, chief priests and elders of the people — a very suspicious source! For, is it not on record, that the scribes and pharisees, chief priests and elders of the people,

formerly committed the egregious mistake of regarding one Jesus of Nazareth as an immoral man; of calling him a glutton, a drunkard, a blasphemer, a pestilent fellow, and of finally crucifying him between two thieves? And who will be our guaranty, that they are one whit wiser to-day than they were two thousand years ago? Their opinions, therefore, can be of no weight with a wise man. They have no time to devote to the study of moral doctrines; it is enough for them to keep up their respectability. Their doctrines, if they have any, can serve the inquirer after truth only by showing him what truth is not.

Some persons, however, not exactly of this class, have questioned the moral tendency of these novels; and their questioning demands attention, and deserves to be treated with respect. But we would ask them, if they have thoroughly studied these works? Have they done anything more than to read them as interesting stories or amusing tales? Have they examined their moral bearing, looked through society, ascertained its actual sins, and the remedies demanded? Have they duly considered the influence these novels are fitted to have in expelling our actual sins? A book may be very useful, indispensable, in checking or removing a certain class of sins, which actually prevail, although it should be a dangerous book in a community where those sins were unknown; as a drug, which would cause instant death if administered to a person in perfect health, may be a most valuable medicine in restoring the system which is diseased. We must be thoroughly acquainted with the diseases which affect society, as well as with what would be perfect social health, before we can pronounce definitely concerning the tendency of this or that publication. Now have these persons, who condemn Bulwer's novels, become thoroughly acquainted with the social system, in its diseased manifestations as well as in its healthy manifestations, and ascertained by actual experiment what medicines are necessary to restore health, as well as

what treatment is necessary to preserve it? If not, their judgment need not be taken as final.

But, be the tendency of these novels what it may, we ask what English novelist of our times gives us novels of a better moral tendency? What novelist surpasses Bulwer in the homage which he pays to that morality which seeks the public good, which calls upon all public men to form opinions for themselves, to ascertain on what principles the public good is based, and to adhere to those principles, through good report and through evil? There are none of his contemporaries, we are acquainted with, in whom we find so deep a cast of reflection, so generous a tone of sentiment, so tender a concern for human well-being, so frequent reference to the fact, that we live not for ourselves alone, and that we are to find our own good only in seeking that of others. He, who surpasses all his countrymen, though he attain not to the highest ideal, should receive some mercy at our hands. Among Bulwer's contemporaries in his own country, we can find no one to be placed before him, unless it be Thomas Carlyle. We have a strong love for Carlyle. We like him for his hearty hatred of cant and formulas; for his indomitable love of independence; his rich imagination; his poetic sensibility; his tenderness and pathos; his wit and humor; his broad and generous sympathies; his worship of the genuine, and his detestation of the seeming; and — for his wonderful facility in the use of the English language. Taking the world as it is, we think his writings likely to have a healing influence, and therefore are we glad to see them circulate: but we cannot rank him above Bulwer, nor even so high. All his best thoughts may be found in Bulwer, who is free from that in him which we do not like. Carlyle's views, taken in themselves, without any special reference to the dominant tendencies of the age, are far from being unexceptionable. His morality, notwithstanding its transcendental garb, is of the school of Goethe, and may be summed up in the formula, "Act out Thyself;" and

his philosophy, if philosophy he have, is not much better than Hume's. It ends, like Hume's, in skepticism, albeit by following a different route. In his "Sartor Resartus" he says many fine things, sometimes in a fantastic, sometimes in a surpassingly beautiful manner;—fine things, which make one think he sympathizes with the untitled and hard-handed many, and is ready to devote himself, soul and body, to their cause; but he has no faith in efforts to meliorate society, and he sneers at him who would labor for "the progress of the species." He weeps over the wrongs of Humanity, and mocks at all efforts to right them. He bids us work, but assures us our working will come to nought; he detests the old social garment, but bids us beware of attempting to weave a new one. Now he is a furious jacobin, and now a staunch conservative. We hardly know what to make of him. We feel and own his power; we imagine him original and profound; and yet, when we have divested his thoughts of the unwonted garb in which he has clothed them, they almost always turn out to be our old acquaintances. But, be this as it may, the man who could find it in his heart to turn the French Revolution into burlesque, and to play the Merry-Andrew amid the dissolution of the old feudal and Catholic world, and over the well-meant, but not always wisely-directed, efforts of the French people to construct a new and better world, can never, with us, rank as a truly moral man.

Bulwer may want Carlyle's power, his wit, his humor, his pathos, his transcendentalism; but he surpasses him in plain common sense, and in the healthiness of the tone of his writings. He has a firmer faith in virtue, in man, and in the utility of efforts to advance society. We never find him sneering at honest efforts to promote the welfare of mankind; he does not deify man, and then mock him, because he does not act the god becomingly. He everywhere inculcates the lesson of charity and mutual tolerance; he takes man as he finds him, a being of clay as well as of spirit, liable to fall as well as able to rise, pos-

sessing freedom of will, indeed, but subject to a thousand influences pressing in upon him from without, which he can neither resist nor divert; and with all these imperfections clinging to him, he shows that he loves and respects him, and that we too should love and respect him, and the more instead of the less because of his imperfections. Is not this a correct view of man, and is not the moral to be extracted from it a healthy one?

In giving this general estimate of the moral bearing of these novels, we of course except *Falkland*, — the earliest of Mr. Bulwer's prose publications, — because it was a production of his youth, and he himself has since publicly objected to it, as unsound in its philosophy and false in its coloring of life. It belongs to the school of Werter and Childe Harold, — a dark, desponding, sentimental school, of most unhealthy influence, — and as the author has shown no attachment to that school in his subsequent publications, we should be unfair critics, were we to take this work into the account in making up our estimate of his general merits.

In *Pelham*, the work by which the author first became known, to any extent, in this country, and the first of his works in which the bent of his genius, his moral and political tendencies, became decidedly manifest, he has been said to teach a low and debasing moral. Mr. Henry Pelham is so respectable, has so many attractions, so much real worth, notwithstanding his dandyism and devotion to pleasure, that our good folks, simple souls! imagine it was the author's design to commend dandyism and devotion to pleasure as essential elements in the character of a gentleman. But the real design of the author has been, we take it, to show us that a young man, thrown into the vortex of fashionable dissipation, surrounded by dissolute companions, beset on every hand by temptations to sin, may gradually brighten his character, attain to much useful knowledge of men and things, acquire just notions of public virtue, and become a man of solid worth for the soundness of his understanding,

the strength of his attachments, and the firmness with which he adheres to the principles on which he has convinced himself the public good is based. The author would teach us, that we may pass for men of fashion, men of the world, without becoming lost to all sense of right and wrong, or indifferent to the welfare of our friends, our country, or mankind. He intended *Henry Pelham* for a satire on the race of dandies of the epoch in which the work was written ; but should even the dandies of our day mistake him for the model of a gentleman, and attempt to imitate him, their morals would probably be mended rather than injured. Many too, who abuse Mr. *Henry Pelham* most shamefully, might very advantageously take lessons of him in both private morals and public.

None of the author's works have been more rudely assailed than *Paul Clifford*. In this work, we are gravely told by grave moralists, the author recommends highway robbery ; or, in other words, that he paints the robber in such fascinating colors, and surrounds his profession with so many attractions, that we are made to feel an almost irresistible inclination to take the road. There is no reasoning against this statement, because they who make it doubtless know the best what they feel ; and all we can do is, when we travel abroad, to see that our pistols are in proper order. Still, we cannot help thinking, that this love of the robber's life must be inherent in the hearts of these people, rather than produced by Mr. Bulwer's descriptions ; for we have never found them creating in us any disposition to become highwaymen ; they have rather produced in us a firm resolution to do what we can so to perfect the social state, that robbery shall not be one of its fruits. In his history of *Paul Clifford* and his associates, the author has shown us, — what he intended, — that many of the depravities of individual character are due to the depravities of that social state in which the character is formed. *Paul Clifford* has no innate love of vice ; nay, he is naturally well inclined, and has an honorable ambition to

obtain his living by a useful and just calling. He does not become a highwayman from choice, nay, not without repugnance ; but through the force of circumstances with which he is surrounded, and which he cannot control. He is corrupted and made a robber by influences which he had not the innate power to resist, and no man who sees him can help regarding him as more sinned against than sinning ; in other words, as a victim of an imperfect, a corrupt social state. We are led by the author to transfer our indignation from Paul to the social state, which abandoned him to the corrupting influences which operated his fall ; and, instead of seeking to chastise the victim, we are led to labor for the regeneration of society itself. This is an important moral, and the one which will require many such novels as *Paul Clifford* to teach effectually.

An excellent divine of this city, a friend of ours, said to us one day, " We have not yet learned the responsibility of society to individuals. We talk much of the responsibility of individuals to society, but we forget that society is bound to protect all her children. I was sometime since dining with a distinguished Judge of the King's Bench, in London. The conversation turned, as you may well imagine, on the condition of the poor. I said to the Judge,

" Sir, did you observe those poor children, ragged and incrustated with filth, which you passed to-day in driving from your house to Westminster Hall ? "

" No, I observed none. "

" Yet you must have passed some hundreds. "

" It is very likely ; but it did not occur to me to observe them. "

" And what must be the fate of these poor children ? "

" Some of them will die of disease, some may emigrate, and some I shall probably hang. "

" What means can they have of obtaining an honest and honorable living ? "

" I am sure I do not know. "

"Is there any alternative for them but to beg, to steal, or to starve?"

"I presume not."

"And have you considered their condition, ascertained their wants, and done what you could to avert the evils to which they are exposed?"

"Not at all. I have been otherwise engaged."

"Let me tell you, then, Sir, that I would rather take my stand, at the Day of Judgment, with those you will *hang*, than with yourself."

"Sir, do you intend to insult me?"

"By no means. I would simply assure you that I regard those you will doom to be hung, as less guilty than yourself. God has given you talents, education, wealth, and a commanding position in society, and yet you can pass daily, unnoticed, hundreds of young beings, who, as they grow up, must necessarily beg, steal, or starve. You do not see them; you do not think of their wretched condition; you do nothing to save them from that crime on which you may hereafter sit in judgment; and am I to regard them as guilty, and you as innocent,—you who might, had you put forth your hand, have saved them from falling victims to a corrupt and corrupting social organization?"

The zeal of our friend, the divine, perhaps transported him too far; but he read the Judge a sound lecture, and one which we would repeat in thunder-tones, if we could, to the very soul of every man placed in a position from which he can act on society. Still, we would spare the Judge, by including him as well as those he hangs, among the victims of society in its present defective organization. The rich man, the man of talents and education, occupying an honorable and important post in society, who can forget the poor and exposed, fail to observe the thousands growing up for the prison or the gallows, and refuse to labor day and night to save them from the doom which must await them, is, of all the victims of society, the one most sincerely to be pitied, and whose hard lot is the one least of all to be envied.

We shall have occasion to resume this subject before we close ; we merely add now that Paul Clifford can recommend the robber's life to no one not already inclined to lead it ; and it seems to us more likely to arrest a tendency to become highwaymen than any homily which could be read from the pulpit. It is worthy of note, that if you will but admit to those who are at war with society, that they have some little justice on their side, they are disarmed of their hostile feelings, and ready to lead peaceful and honest lives. This much Paul Clifford does for men who, like him, have been debarred from honest and honorable pursuits. The work, however, is designed not for robbers, at least not for bold highwaymen, but for the people at large. It was written to urge forward a social reform, which the author believed to be necessary, and it teaches a similar moral to that of " Caleb Williams," only in a more agreeable manner, and with a more happy effect on the nerves and temper of the reader.

In *Ernest Maltravers*, which has also been censured, the author has taken a higher and broader aim than in any of his previous works. His design has been to give us a general picture of the philosophy of life, and he has brought to the execution of his task a maturity of intellect, an amount of information, a familiar acquaintance with the more secret operations of the human soul, and a depth and truth of pathos, that even his warmest admirers were hardly prepared to expect. It is decidedly the ablest, the most original, the sincerest, and the most finished of his productions, and the one which will perhaps contribute the most to his ultimate fame. *Ernest Maltravers* is a young man of lofty genius, brilliant acquirements, noble enthusiasm, generous, and even virtuous feelings and aims. The world is bright before him ; well-born and rich, what shall hinder him from running a noble career, and achieving an honorable and a lasting fame ? He is ambitious, but ambitious mainly of being worthy of himself, of preserving his heart and his character

unsullied. But Ernest Maltravers is a man, and, like all men, subject to the infirmities of the flesh. He is not, therefore, to go through life without his trials, his conflicts, his defeats. He shall fall; what is noblest in his nature and most enviable in his condition, shall betray him, and his vices, as it were, shall grow out of his virtues; shame, grief, remorse, shall sink him deeper yet. Disappointment shall discourage him; the lessons of the worldly, acquaintance with the hypocrisies of the world, shall sicken him of life, incrust his heart, make him withdraw himself from mankind, and despair of himself and of society. But he shall not fall utterly. The same causes, his very errors and vices, aided by his own reflections and intercourse with those who have forgiven the world, shall, in the end, work out his reformation, rekindle in his heart the flame of his early love, restore to him his native vigor and hopefulness, and prepare him to be a wiser and better man for his fall. Such is the author's conception, under its moral aspect, and we do not hesitate to pronounce it a conception formed in the very spirit of the Christian religion, as well as in a high school of art, and indicating no ordinary insight into the motives of human conduct, and the influence of the passions, of both good and evil, virtue and vice, sin and shame, joy and grief, in the formation of character.

Superficial moralists may allege, that the moral of the character would have been more perfect, had Ernest Maltravers been carried through the world without ever succumbing to temptation, or falling into a single error; but we cannot think so. It would have been the easiest thing in the world for the author to have so represented him; but he would then have been an unnatural character, and adapted to no purpose whatever. It is his failures that redeem him. We are not among those who think meanly of human nature, of man's capacity for an enlarged and generous virtue; but we confess that we have found nothing in experience of actual life, or in our philosophizing on

the powers of the human soul, to warrant us in believing, that any man can ever so live and so act as never to need repentance and pardon. Gladly would we believe otherwise if we could ; for, of all humiliation, that, which comes from a consciousness of our own guilt, is the most intolerable. But innocence, joined with great abilities, the most judicious education, and the most virtuous intentions, is no shield against temptation, and cannot preserve a man scathless through the fiery furnace he is doomed to pass. No man has any right to presume, that, in his own strength, he can go through the world without sinning. Even his confidence in himself, his consciousness of his own innocence, and his determination to maintain his character free from vice or crime, shall, in the absence of all other causes, effect his downfall. We know not why it should be so ; but it is not in man that walketh, to direct his steps, and such is the constitution of this world, that the proudest must some day find occasion to exclaim with the publican, " God be merciful to me a sinner ! "

Some persons think that it would be possible so to bring up our children, that they should never lose the innocence of childhood. We do not believe it. The garden of childhood is lovely, and in it grow the trees pleasant to the sight ; the tree of life grows there ; but, also, in the midst, grows the tree of the knowledge of good and evil ; and, alas ! we pluck its fruit ere it occurs to us to eat of the tree of life, and our fall and expulsion become inevitable. We know this doctrine is a sad one, that it is painful to think, that, do what we will to keep the garden and dress it, we shall be driven forth to wander, guilty, heart-broken vagabonds, over the wide waste of life alone, till God's Son, on his errand of mercy to seek and save the lost, calls us back as penitents, pardons us, and ushers us into that celestial paradise of which the earthly was but a type !

Wisdom and virtue spring from the divine depths of sorrow, and sorrow comes from sin. They grow

only as watered by the tears which flow not till a consciousness of wrong doing has opened their sluices. Poor man, in the pride of his innocency, would that his father should give him his portion of his goods, and permit him to go forth and seek his fortune for himself. Vain fool ! he will spend his substance with harlots and in riotous living, and see himself reduced to the necessity of begging of the swine a share of the husks they eat. No man can, before trial, obtain the strength necessary to triumph. It is only in the trial, in the struggle with the world, the flesh, and the devil, that his spiritual strength is developed ; and not till he is scarred all over with a thousand defeats, does he become able to conquer. So it has been, and so we fear it always will be. We reach heaven by passing through the devil's territory. If there be another road, we have not discovered it.

Still, education is not in vain. The poor wretch, eating or begging to eat husks with the swine, *remembers* that there was bread enough in his father's house ; and this remembrance acts as one of the principal causes in effecting his return. So shall the memory of childhood's innocency, and the wise lessons then taught us, awaken in us, in our humiliation, a desire to return, to recover from our degradation, and shall suggest to us the means. The seeds which are sown will indeed lie long embedded in the human heart ; but when the storms of passion shall have passed over it, when the tears of deep sorrow shall have watered it, by the genial warmth of heaven they shall spring up and bear the rich and delicious fruits of wisdom and virtue. We may, then, give our children the best education we can, but the unskilful navigator will capsize the boat or run it aground, till experience has taught him how to manage it. The instructions we give may abridge, may render efficient, but they will not supersede, the severe lessons which are learned only in the bitter school of experience.

But, to leave this train of thought, we are inclined to approve these works of Bulwer for the very reasons

for which they are usually condemned. It is a remarkable feature of the popular writers of our times, that they portray almost entirely the characters of individuals generally regarded as reprobates, and that they portray them with many amiable qualities, represent them as performing many noble and disinterested acts, and rarely fail to enlist our sympathies in their behalf. This is thought to be an evidence of the corruptions of the age, of the low standard of morals adopted, and many good men and women mourn over it as an indication of a general dissolution of society, and of the impending fate of Sodom and Gomorrah; but we look upon it as a proof of the increasing morality of the age, of the secret, but sure working of Christianity, and of the more extended and salutary manifestation of its divine spirit. It is to us one of the encouraging signs of the times. The literary productions, in which villains appear and demand our respect, engage our sympathy, and, to some extent, even our admiration, do not, in our judgment, teach a false or a dangerous morality.

If Christianity be distinguished from all other religions by any one feature, it is certainly by the estimate it forms of the guilty, and the manner in which it commands us to treat them. It commands us to love and respect even the sinner. This is its crowning glory. Its followers may not as yet have comprehended the full import of this command, nor observed it either in their feelings or their actions; but the binding nature of God's commands is not impaired by men's ignorance and disobedience. Respect for the sinful, we grant, has not been a prominent feature of even professed Christians; but it is not the less a Christian duty on that account. God loves them, and commends his love to them; for Saint Paul assures us, that God commended his love towards us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us. The whole mission of Jesus was a mission of love to the ungodly; and that none might be left to reject this mission, or to condemn the wicked, God hath included us *all* under

sin, that he might have mercy upon all. Jesus always preferred the publicans and sinners to the scribes and pharisees, and assured the religious and conventionally moral of his age, that publicans and harlots should go into the kingdom of heaven sooner than they.

Christianity also teaches us never to despair of a fellow-being. According to it, there is hope for the very chief of sinners. Jesus has bowels for the most depraved, the most hardened, and permits, nay, invites, the "vilest sinner to return." Is there no significance in all this? Was there no meaning in his permission of "a woman that was a sinner," to wash his feet, and anoint them with oil? Meant he nothing, when he bade the adulteress "go and sin no more," and rebuked her accusers, by bidding him who was without sin to cast the first stone? Meant he nothing, when he told the thief crucified with him on the cross, "this day shalt thou be with me in paradise"? To us there is meaning in all this. It teaches us exceeding tenderness to the sinner, that no moral pollution can wholly obliterate the original brightness of the soul, or authorize us to believe that nothing good remains. We should abhor the sin, but never the sinner.

Mankind have not generally adopted this principle. They have generally thought it necessary to be exceedingly angry at the wicked, that is, at those they have regarded as the wicked; to manifest a sort of righteous horror at their presence; to treat them with contempt and ignominy; to pursue them with chains, imprisonment, and death. They have borrowed the armor of hell to fight the battles of heaven with. But, in point of fact, nothing is more unjust, or more impolitic even, than this. The sinner is a man, and his reformation is that which should be aimed at. There is joy in heaven with the angels of God over the sinner that repenteth. All good spirits rejoice with joy unspeakable when the sin-sick soul is restored to health.

Now, if we would reform the sinner, we must begin

by recognising in him something worth reforming. We must feel that he is still a man and a brother; that, though he may have erred and fallen, he is still a glorious nature, and is worth redeeming. He will never be reformed by angry denunciation, by being contemned, and declared to retain nothing good or commendable. He is never reformed by having his sins spread out before him. We do him no good by exhibiting before him his deep and loathsome depravity, and assuring him how hateful he is to all good men and angels. The exhibition will only aggravate his horror of himself, and drive him to desperation. Just in proportion as we cause him to lose his self-respect, and to despair of our respect for him, do we endanger or retard his return to virtue. But this is a lesson we shall never learn to practise, so long as we retain our old notions concerning those we pronounce the guilty. Now, this lesson modern literature is teaching us, unconsciously on the part of its authors, it may be, and not perhaps in the clearest and most direct manner, we admit; but still in the only manner in which it can be taught, things being as they are; — this lesson, we say, modern literature is teaching us by the exhibition it makes of the reprobate, the good it shows in them, and the sympathy it enlists in their behalf. Its tendency, then, so far from being irreligious and immoral, as many good people fear, is highly moral, and encouraging to the Christian philanthropist.

No man loves sin for its own sake; no man does wrong for the love of wrong-doing. Every man, in the exercise of his better nature, loves virtue, and yields it a heartfelt homage. That he does not practise it, is owing not entirely to his corrupt volitions, but to his ignorance, to the wrong bias which was early given to his propensities, to the customs of society, to the influence of his condition, to factitious social arrangements, to various circumstances, which overpower his weakness, hinder his good resolutions from ripening into deeds, — prevent him from doing

the good that he would do, and compel him to do the evil that he would not.

In the worst of mankind, there are exhaustless stores of goodness, generous sympathy, disinterestedness, craving after moral excellence; in the most abandoned, there is ever raging a fierce conflict between good and evil, a terrible struggle between the flesh and the spirit, between conscience and inclination, the sense of duty and the love of pleasure; and even in them the good triumphs oftener than the bad, the spirit reigns more habitually than the flesh. Now, when we see a fellow-being torn by these contending principles, worn out and disheartened by a sense of the frequent defeats of the better nature, it is our duty to fly to his relief, and to aid him to subdue the enemies he has to contend against. But we do never relieve him, we never encourage and strengthen him, by fierce looks and angry gestures, by denunciation and wrath. He stands not so much in need of reproof, as of hope and moral strength,—of remorse, not so much as of solace and refreshment. He is pained and mortified by a sense of his own failures, loathes himself, and would fain fly from his own company. Nothing in this case will do him good but that which tends to calm his irritated spirit, to reconcile him to himself, to make him feel that he is not clean gone in iniquity, that it is not all over with him yet, that another effort, and he may succeed, rise from his fallen estate, and gain a standing among the virtuous and the good.

The world comprehends little of all this struggle. It has anger and reproach for the wrong-doer; it turns away with loathing from the fallen; and leaves the wretched to die. It reaches not forth the hand to raise the fallen brother; says not, Rise, and be of good cheer. Ah! it is a hard and difficult lesson to learn, that of kindness to the sinner, respect for the outcast, and few have ever learned it. None ever learned it perfectly save Jesus of Nazareth, for none but he ever knew the full worth of even a guilty soul; the severe struggles to which the sinner is

exposed, the temptations he has to withstand, the thousand obstacles he has to overcome. And none, but he, ever showed proper respect for sinners ; and he did show it, when, in the death agony, he exclaimed, " Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do ! "

Modern literature may not directly tend to enforce this lesson ; but it springs from the secret though sure working of the great Christian principle which involves it. It proves that the age is taking broader and more generous views of man and men, and is exploding the old doctrine of condign punishment, and the old dream that one sin corrupts the whole man, and renders him henceforth incapable of a holy feeling, a reasonable thought, or a virtuous action.

Mr. Bulwer has finely illustrated this last in his *Eugene Aram*, a work which teaches, to us, a most salutary moral truth, but one which we have seen no notice taken of. Eugene is a scholar, full of generous dreams, of kind feelings, and laudable ambition ; but he coolly, deliberately, without any provocation, commits a murder, and that too for a paltry sum of money. One can frame something of an excuse for him who, in hot blood, murders a man who has deeply injured him, who is his bitter enemy ; but what excuse can we frame for him who murders a man, who has not injured him, with whom he has no cause of quarrel, and merely for the sake of money ? According to all our ordinary modes of judging, he must be a cold-hearted reprobate, and from whom it would be madness to hope for anything good. But Eugene not only commits a murder of this sort ; he not only possesses himself of the fruits of robbery and murder, but he never repents of the deed, never feels any remorse for the act. What a hardened wretch ! Yet Eugene was one of the kindest-hearted of men. His life was, even after the murder, singularly moral, and his heart was alive to everything beautiful and good. He loved all nature, and indulged no hatred to the human race. He did not become cold, morose, misanthropic, and imagine that, because he had wronged mankind, mankind were grossly

depraved. He would injure no human being, no living thing; he would turn aside his foot, that he might not crush the worm. What is the moral of all this, but that one misdeed, of however black a character, does by no means argue a depraved soul, or indicate that the heart is a soil in which no virtues can grow? This, to us, is the moral of Eugene Aram, whether we take him in his true character, or as represented by Bulwer in his novel; and it is the moral which every man may extract from his own experience of himself, and of life in general.

Taking this fact into view, there is little danger of dressing up those, whom society generally pronounces the wicked, in too fascinating colors. Society cannot be made to believe them better than they really are, or be led to pay them more respect than they deserve. Who would be induced to murder, by being taught to contemplate Eugene Aram as a worthy man, a man of extraordinary talents, of vast erudition, and commanding genius, as filled with the love of virtue, overflowing with kindness, notwithstanding the fact of his having been a murderer? Who would turn pirate, because Cleveland, in Scott's novel, is shown, notwithstanding his piratical character, able to engage and retain the devoted love of the high-minded and virtuous Minna? If we know anything of the human heart, the study of these characters must have an entirely opposite effect. The striking contrast between the real worth of the man, and the meanness or wickedness of the act or pursuit, brings home to us in the most forcible manner possible the hatefulness of sin. We do not hate sin when we see it in such a character as Lunley Ferrers, because it seems to us to be in perfect harmony with his soul, a matter of course. We detest the man, not his acts, viewed separately from himself. But sin in an Ernest Maltravers becomes to us exceedingly hateful; it affects us in the most painful manner; it is a spot on what were else unsullied beauty; it mars what were else exact proportion; and hides that sweet loveliness we would adore. It is only when the great,

the beautiful, the gifted, the good sin, that we do really see the exceeding sinfulness of sin ; for it is only then that it appears so much out of place that we can, as it were, abstract it from the sinner, and contemplate it in itself, and see it in its own hideousness. We have, then, no fears of the world's being corrupted by the exhibition of the sinner in a light too favorable, in a dress too fascinating.

What we have thus far said, however, needs one qualification. It is strictly true in respect to those generally regarded as sinners, but not true in respect to that class of sinners,—and a numerous class it is, too,—which society is not sufficiently advanced to regard as sinners. The fact is, those, whom we usually brand as reprobates, are not so much worse than we, who assume to be the virtuous part of the community, as we commonly imagine. We keep within conventional rules, we do not outrage the public conscience ; but in the sight of God we may be more guilty than those whom we subject to our penal justice. Our deeds are tolerated ; our characters, therefore, may be decked out in robes which shall deceive the young and unsuspecting. Suppose a moralist in the times of our Savior had chosen his hero from among the scribes and pharisees, made him the impersonation of the class from which he was taken, and sought to make him pass for the *beau ideal* of the moral, religious, and social virtues, his influence would have been grossly immoral, because he would have given a false morality, and yet have found that in the manners and customs of his age, in the public conscience, which would have sustained him, and given efficiency to his representations. Conservatives may represent vice in dangerous colors, because what they represent is not by the more respectable portion of society regarded as vice, but as virtue. The radical, or he who is at odds with society as it is, can rarely do this. He cannot be a corrupter of public morals by his too favorable representations of vice, for he has society with its main force armed against him, and ready to expose the least deviation, on his

part, from the strictest morality. A Scott may dress vice in too favorable colors, and do harm, not a Godwin ; because the vice Scott will embellish is the vice the popular voice has not yet condemned ; but should a Godwin embellish a vice, it would be an unpopular one, and therefore one without any general influence. Scott, in fact, does corrupt public morals ; he does it by the too amiable light in which he depicts the old cavaliers, and the odium he casts upon the puritans, the covenanters, the old whigs, and the advocates of liberty and social progress in general. In all countries, and in all ages, history proves that the tendency to order is much stronger and more universal than the tendency to liberty, and that mankind are much more disposed to submit to the evils they are acquainted with, than, by attempting to remove them, to run the risk of others they know not of. They, then, who seek to spread a halo around the past, to make men quiet under the existing order of things, ready and staunch to uphold the monstrous injustice which is daily practised, and strong and bold only in suppressing all efforts to obtain a redress of grievances, are the immoral writers, the really dangerous writers, because they commend only what it is popular to commend, and are sure to be sustained by those who profit most by the wrongs which should be righted. They are false prophets, prophesying peace, peace, when there is no peace, and should be no peace ; for all peace, so long as injustice obtains, is both impracticable and criminal.

But, in order to justify the general tenor of our remarks, it must be admitted, that individuals are not alone responsible for the acts for which they are condemned. We hold, that society herself is responsible for not a little of the wrong she condemns and punishes. Man is passive as well as active ; and he is acted upon by society, and corrupted by it, as well as it is acted upon and corrupted by him ; and he is undoubtedly much oftener the victim than the criminal. This is the moral we extract from Paul Clifford ;

and it is one that society must learn and observe, before she will have any right to pursue with much severity those whom she is pleased to denominate offenders.

This great truth, that individuals are not alone responsible for their acts, that society shares the responsibility with them, has not received that place in our moral and criminal codes which its importance demands. Robert Owen caught a glimpse of it, but only on one side. He recognised man's passivity, but failed to perceive his activity. He saw that an artificial and improperly organized society was not merely the effect of individual depravity, but also a cause; that circumstances had much influence in the formation of our characters, and therefore he inferred that our characters are formed altogether by circumstances, without any coöperation of our own. We are, therefore, wholly creatures of circumstances, and in order to make us what we ought to be, nothing is necessary but to surround us with the proper circumstances. Hence, his new scheme of society, and his attempt to induce us to live in parallelograms. His dream was a beautiful one, and has not been altogether fruitless; but its realization was impracticable, because it made no allowance for individual activity; because it recognised only a part of human nature; and, more especially, because it needed for its introduction, the virtue which, according to its own principles, could be obtained only by its successful operation.

The Saint-Simonians, in France, also obtained a glimpse of the great truth we are speaking of, and proposed a reconstruction of society on a basis altogether new. Of all world-reformers, world-makers, these Saint-Simonians are, in our judgment, entitled to the highest rank. They were profound students of man and society, and, so far as we can see, they overlooked no element of human nature. They recognised the community element, for which Mr. Owen contended, and also the individual element, which is recognised by existing society, and made one the limit of

the other. They acknowledged, too, the religious nature of man, which Mr. Owen denied, and gave to religion the highest rank. Their object was to devise a social scheme, which, avoiding the false principles of present society, should allow man ample scope for the full development of all his faculties, his whole nature, in the order intended by the Creator. But, though they formed the body of Adám, and moulded his features according to the most approved lines of beauty, they could not breathe into his nostrils the breath of life. There was wanting the elemental fire, which could be struck out only after the body had become a living soul. So, their scheme, like many others, fell to pieces; but the ideas concerning man and society, which they put forth, are not dead, and will not die; but, modified by time and experience, they will exert a mighty influence on the future of our race.

Society, as it is at present organized, causes no small share of the depravity we lament and punish in individuals; but all schemes for destroying it, and constructing a new one in its place, will prove abortive, however wisely or prudently they may be devised: for this plain reason, that *the social state of any given epoch is never an arbitrary creation*. It grows out of the elements of human nature, and is permanently modified only as those elements themselves are modified. A new social state, constructed according to the true theory of man in the abstract, would soon fail, even could it be introduced, because it would find no support in the actual intelligence, habits, customs, associations, and affections of the people. We have always listened with great respect to all who have been disposed to tell us their plans for regenerating society, and often with gratitude; but we have never had any faith in the practicability of any scheme, which did not assume society as it is, as its point of departure. God forbid, that we should cling with any superstitious fondness to the old social garment. We see as clearly, perhaps, as most men, its numerous rents, and, above all, its awkward and inconvenient

fashion. We would modify existing society, and as radically as any one ; but we must take it as it is to begin with, and find in its actual constitution the law of our proceeding ; reform, not destroy ; develop, instead of creating. And this we would do, gradually indeed, but still as rapidly as possible, till we brought the social state into complete harmony, not merely with the human nature which we see developed to-day, but with that human nature which lies deep within the possible, and whose majesty and loveliness none but a few enthusiasts, a few prophets and seers, have as yet dreamed of.

But, while we confess to our own want of faith in any scheme of social reform which proposes to remodel society altogether, or which proposes any modifications of existing society faster than may be warranted by a more full development of human nature, we hold it of great importance that the defects of the existing social organization should be pointed out, and its influence in the formation of individual character strenuously insisted upon. All books which draw our attention to this subject, whatever the special doctrines they teach, have a value. For the more we look at it, the less angry shall we be at offenders, and the more forcibly shall we be struck with the fact, that they are to a great extent but the victims of an order of things of which we, who regard ourselves as the virtuous, are the strenuous supporters, and which, if we would, we could easily so modify as greatly to diminish the number of victims. We like Paul Clifford, because it exposes, in a masterly manner, the hypocrisies of society, and draws our attention to corrupting social influences, teaches us to forgive even the robber, to see the man beneath the highwayman's disguise, and to look upon him as receiving greater wrong than he commits. In a word, it reminds us that, if we would be true moralists, we must seek to reform society not less than individuals.

We have thus far spoken of Mr. Bulwer's novels in their moral character and tendency. We should be

glad to say something more of their purely literary merits, but for this we have left ourselves no space.

In conceiving and drawing characters, Bulwer holds a high rank, though not the highest. In what concerns the external man, he does not compare with Scott; but in what concerns the internal man, in detecting and describing the secret springs of action, the subtler workings of the human heart, the struggles of passion, the conflicts of the spirit and the flesh, he immeasurably surpasses him. His characters are in general faithful to nature, but they appear to be made up by laborious effort, and not spontaneous creations, as is the case with the productions of true genius. We regard Mr. Bulwer, therefore, more as a man of talent than of genius.

Bulwer's mind is rather philosophical than poetical. He has made several attempts at poetry, and though he has not wholly failed, we cannot regard him as a genuine poet. As a philosopher, if reference be had to the higher philosophy, to metaphysics, properly so called, he has no great merit. He has perceived many of the great problems of human nature, and he shows himself somewhat accustomed to psychological analysis, but he does not appear to have attained to any clear and systematic views. There is still much doubt, much confusion in his own mind, and not a little in his writings. He evidently rejects gross materialism, but whether he has been able to attain to a legitimate spiritualism, does not appear. He seems to have embraced phrenology, which is somewhat better than sensualism, we admit; but, as we have heretofore attempted to prove, by no means a complete philosophy of man.

As a moralist, we have defended him so far as the actual tendency of his works is concerned. His system of morality we have not ascertained. He is not a Hobbist, nor an advocate for the selfish scheme. His aim in his works has not been to construct an ethical system, but to induce his countrymen to labor more earnestly for the public good. He does not make the

public good, we presume, the criterion of virtue in general, but merely the end which governments, politicians, the statesman, should always seek ; by which every law, every measure, every act of a public or private man, which bears upon the public, should be tested. He concerns himself mainly with that branch of morals, which treats of the duties of individuals to society, and of society to individuals. In this branch of morals, we apprehend, he is right in making the public good the rule.

His object, in all his works, is the improvement of masses of men rather than the creation of individual excellence. This may not at all times indicate the highest moral purpose, but in the actual state of things, when the moralists of the church confine themselves almost exclusively to the promotion of private and domestic virtue, regarding men almost solely in their individual and domestic relations, it can hardly imply any want of high moral feeling, to represent private and domestic virtue as worthless, if it leave the millions to suffer all the evils of ignorance, vice, poverty, and tyranny. He not only does this, but he addresses himself to the higher classes of his countrymen, the rich, the well-born, the educated, the talented, who are wasting themselves on trifles, suffering from satiety, and seeking in vain for successful methods of making time hang less heavy on their hands ; and he labors to convince them that there is a PUBLIC for them to regard, a PEOPLE to whom they may speak, whose good they may consult, which they can promote, and that in seeking to promote the public good, the good of the people, they shall find their own good. This, we take it, is not a bad moral, and one which every wise man must wish to see enforced.

In conclusion, we have only to add, that, in our estimation, Mr. Bulwer's works are chiefly valuable for the bearing they have on the great controversies of the day. They have been produced in the midst of a revolution, and to some of the various phases of that revolution, they all directly or indirectly relate.

They have been written, we say, in the midst of a revolution. It is so. A revolution has been and is going on throughout all christendom. In all christendom, there is war between the aristocratic element and the democratic element of society. A word has been uttered; the people have heard it, and feel an unwonted fire burn within them. The untitled, the unprivileged Many begin to feel that they were not made merely to be used by the titled and privileged Few. "We too are men," say they; "and, by Heaven, we will be treated as men." They and the few are at war. Every day does the war rage wider and more fiercely. Now, in this fearful but glorious war, we find Bulwer on the right side, fighting, with what skill and bravery are in him, for the PEOPLE. He is for the many, and against the few. We greet him, therefore, as a fellow-soldier in the army of Humanity, and are ready to fight side by side with him in the cause of the Democracy.

Other soldiers there may be in this same cause, wiser and better than he, braver and more disinterested; but, as to that, we inquire not. Every man on the democratic side is our brother in arms, and as such is welcome. His friends we hold to be our friends, and his enemies to be our enemies. And should we not? Should not all who espouse the people's cause, all who dare speak out for man, ever catch a cheering response from the warm heart of young America, Freedom's fairest daughter? Yes. On ye, who war for Freedom in the Old World; ye, who would raise man from the thralldom of kings, nobilities, and hierarchies; ye, who dare to live or dare to die, that ye may work out a greater good for the human race,—on to the battle! The fresh young heart of America leaps to behold you; her sympathies and prayers are with you; and her free voice shall guard your fame, and swell the notes of your triumph!

ART. II. — THE CURRENCY. — *Defects of the existing System — Remedy — Plan of Mr. Webster — Mr. Rives — Mr. Clay — Mr. Van Buren — Retirement of Mr. Biddle — His Character.*

WHEN the Resolutions, adopted at the meeting held on Bunker's Hill, on the fourth of July, 1837, were republished in England, the editor of the London Courier, in commenting upon them, remarked, that the banking system of the United States was the worst in existence. This remark is entitled to the more weight, inasmuch as the articles on political economy, which appear in the London Courier, were at that time written by Professor McCulloch, perhaps the highest living authority in this branch of learning.

The remark will in fact be found, if examined, to be not a mere rhetorical exaggeration, but a literal truth. The essential characteristic of a sound currency is uniformity or steadiness of value. Other qualities, such as durability, beauty, concentration of value in a small compass, convenience for circulation and transportation, are of more or less importance, the indispensable requisite of steadiness being presupposed. Without this, they are of no consequence, because without this no article, however suitable in other respects, can possibly measure value, or indeed anything. A substance, whose dimensions vary, so that a given quantity is at one time a foot long and at another a yard, cannot possibly supply a correct measure of length. A substance, of which the same portion is at one time twice as heavy as at another, cannot possibly be made to furnish a correct and certain estimate of weight. In like manner, a substance, of which a given quantity is worth at one time a dollar, and at another ten dollars, could not possibly be depended on as a measure of value.

Perfection, it is true, is not to be attained or expected in anything human. The most accurate measures that can be contrived will be liable to some slight

variations. Those which approach most nearly to an invariable standard are the best ; those which deviate most widely from it are the worst. But what would be thought of employing as a measure, whether of length, weight, or value, a substance of which variation were not the accidental condition, but the standing law ? Such a substance would, of course, be regarded by every one as the worst that could possibly be imagined for the purpose. Such, however, is precisely the character of the measure of value now employed in this country. Continual variation in amount and value is the regular condition of a currency composed of bank notes, and it is therefore not without reason that it is described by McCulloch as the worst in existence.

Yet, such is the vagueness of the opinions generally held in regard to these subjects, that this very tendency to fluctuate has been sometimes represented as one of the qualities of a sound and good currency. It is the great excellence of our paper-money system, says a Congressional orator, — Mr. Webster, if we are not mistaken, — that it adapts itself to the varying wants of the community, pouring out its treasures with unsparing hand, when the state of business requires them, and again withdrawing them when the demand is over. This language, which would probably be considered as plausible by the admirers of our system, is about as reasonable as it would be to say, that a measure of length, a yard-stick, for example, is an excellent one because it adapts itself to the extent of the article to be measured, lengthening with a long, and growing shorter with a short one. It can hardly be necessary to say, that a person who should make such a remark upon measures of length, would be pronounced at once insane ; yet, such is the force of the delusion created by habit and interest, that a precisely similar remark upon measures of value, passes, in the mouth of a distinguished statesman, for the perfection of wisdom, and is received as such by his admirers and those of the system.

In making these remarks, we consider the subject

simply under an economical point of view, leaving entirely out of the question all the inconveniences of a different kind, though neither few nor small, which belong to the system. We say nothing of the insecurity of paper money in all its forms, or of the political injustice and inequality of banking monopolies. We look at bank notes merely as a measure of value, and we say that a system that assigns this function to an article which is not merely subject to accidental variations, but of which variation is the essential characteristic and standing law, is not merely bad, but, as it is described by Professor McCulloch,—the worst in existence,—we might say with truth, the worst in principle that can possibly be imagined.

The nature of the inconveniences, arising from a variable and fluctuating measure of value, has become too familiar to us by sad experience, and particularly by the fatal convulsions of the last two years, to require to be stated in detail. They are precisely analogous, as has often been remarked, to those which are produced on the human frame by habitual intemperance; a regular alternation of periods of unnatural activity and deadly exhaustion, producing a gradually increasing weakness, which terminates in the complete prostration of health and life. When the common measure diminishes in value,—in other words, when the banks discount freely, and money is abundant and cheap, a feverish spring is given to the business of the community in all its departments. Speculation spreads her baleful wings and scatters poison far and wide through the land. A bewildering frenzy seizes on the steadiest minds, and hurries them headlong into schemes of the wildest extravagance. After a while, reaction follows. The banks refuse to discount, and contract their circulation. Money becomes scarce and dear; in some cases, disappears almost entirely. The common measure, in other words, increases very much in value. Contracts must be broken, or fulfilled at enormous sacrifices, in this appreciated currency. Bankruptcy and ruin spread themselves, more or less

widely according to the extent of the fluctuation, through the trading part of the community. In the worst cases, like that which occurred two years ago, the banks themselves give way, and a general crash, like some wide-wasting tropical tornado, sweeps down alike the firmest and the feeblest houses, and involves our whole exchange in one common desolation. At this point, a general panic,—the *delirium tremens*, as it has justly been called, of bank-drunkenness,—commonly intervenes, and darkens still further with its thick cloud of imaginary horror a scene before almost too gloomy for description.

Such are the defects of our present banking system, and such is their practical operation on the community. Whatever may be said upon the subject by speculators and brokers,—the only class of men who have an interest in perpetuating the system, or by opposition orators, who are endeavoring to make what they call *political capital*, by throwing the blame of these fluctuations and their consequences, without rhyme or reason, upon the administration for the time being,—the picture given above will be recognised by all impartial and judicious men as a correct representation of the reality. The principles supposed in it have received the sanction of the ablest financiers in the country, particularly Mr. Gallatin, in his report to the New York Bank Convention of 1837. Mr. Biddle himself, the most determined, because the most deeply interested, advocate of the *system*, saw very clearly, in other days, when his mental vision seems to have been better than it is now, the true state of the case, and described it, through one of his newspaper organs, with great distinctness and precision. *The disease under which we suffer is over-trading caused by over-banking.*

Such, then, is the nature of the evil; where are we to look for the remedy?

On this point, we may remark, in the first place, that we are not to seek, as a remedy, a political nostrum, to be applied to the body politic, while suffering

under the agony of one of the periodical fits of exhaustion, to which we have already alluded, as the natural incidents of *the system*. In these cases there is a loud and general cry for *relief*, as if it were possible, by some direct application, to restore instantaneously the force that has been wasted in a long course of over-action. If it were, in fact, practicable to produce by some artificial stimulus, a momentary revival of vigor, the effect would only be, like that of the drunkard's morning draught, a tenfold aggravation of the evil. For the exhaustion, resulting from over-action, there is no cure but repose. Mr. Biddle indicated this remedy in connexion with the account of the disease alluded to above. *The disease is over-trading caused by over-banking: the remedy is to trade less and bank less.* A period of repose affords opportunity for the exhausted constitution to recruit its powers, and if its general tone be not too much impaired, it will gradually resume its usual state. But it will do this only to go through new and still more distressing alternations of activity and exhaustion, unless, in the mean time, some effectual remedy can be applied to the *principle* of the evil.

Where, then, are we to look for such a remedy? During the long discussions of the last two years, the most prominent men in the country have successively made known their views, and have respectively pointed out three or four courses as those most proper to be adopted. To mention no others, Mr. Webster, Mr. Rives, and Mr. Clay, have each proposed a different plan. The President, on his part, has treated the subject with great care and ability in his three successive messages to Congress. We shall advert briefly to each of these plans, with its bearing and probable efficiency, and conclude by stating succinctly what seems to be the natural and only remedy.

I. Mr. Webster's prescription is that the General Government should *regulate the currency*. This idea was insisted on, at great length, in his two days' speech at the second session of the late Congress, and

announced, with much formality and emphasis, at the public dinner which followed soon after at Faneuil Hall. He is understood to mean by this suggestion, that it is the duty of the General Government to take care that the people are supplied with a good and sufficient paper currency, either by issuing such currency itself, or, if it be issued by others, by adopting such measures as will maintain its credit, prevent abuses, and keep it in a sound and healthy condition. Mr. Webster's opinion probably is, that these objects could only be effected by the establishment of a National Bank, similar to the two that have already existed. This, however, he rather disclaims, and professes to be ready to acquiesce in any other plan that may answer the purpose.

In regard to this suggestion, the first question that arises is, whether the General Government have the right to regulate the currency, in the sense in which the phrase is here understood. The General Government can exercise no powers excepting such as are distinctly given to it by the constitution; and nothing is said in that instrument of any power over the currency, except that of coining money and regulating its value. Mr. Webster derives the power from a supposed authority to regulate commerce; but this supposed authority to regulate commerce is quite as questionable, as the power of regulating the currency, which he deduces from it. The General Government possess, under the constitution, the right to regulate commerce *with foreign nations, between the States, and with the Indian tribes*. These are specific powers, conferred very properly for obvious purposes, but they were not intended to include or imply the power of regulating the ordinary commerce between individuals. This is, in fact, one of the acknowledged functions of the State Governments, and so far is the General Government from interfering with them in this respect, or claiming any such power as Mr. Webster attributes to it, that it habitually adopts, in its own courts, the local legislation of the particular State, in which the

court is held, upon contracts, and all other matters relating to the ordinary commercial intercourse of the citizens. There is, therefore, no foundation whatever for the supposed *right* of the General Government to regulate commerce, and still less, of course, for the right to regulate the currency, which Mr. Webster deduces from it.

But, waiving entirely the question of constitutional power, the inexpediency and impracticability of regulating the currency, in this sense of the phrase, are so apparent, that we are really surprised how a man, like Mr. Webster, could for a moment have indulged the idea. The currency, as here understood, consists of all the bank notes in circulation throughout the country, and would include, by parity of reasoning, all the bills of exchange, promissory notes, checks on banks, and paper credits of every description, that are employed in commerce as substitutes for metallic money. This whole multifarious mass of paper the General Government, according to Mr. Webster, is bound to *regulate*: — that is, to maintain at a uniform value, prevent from fluctuating, and indue with the steadiness which is essential to a sound currency. This is a labor, in comparison with which, the task of Addison's angel, who rode in the whirlwind and directed the storm, would be child's play. By what more than magical process the mighty work is to be effected, the great Expounder has not condescended to inform us. Unless every individual trader and trading company; or, limiting the remark to banks, every banking company in the Union is to have the right of going to the Treasury and getting its paper endorsed by the Government, we really do not see how the slightest approach is to be made towards this miraculous consummation. Mr. Webster would probably tell us, if he could venture to speak his mind, that he looks to a National Bank as the machine which is to work out all these wonders. We shall advert to the value of a National Bank as a remedy for the diseases of the currency, when we come to speak of

the plan of Mr. Clay. In the mean time we may remark here, that the desperate, persevering, and too long successful effort of the Pennsylvania Bank of the United States to prevent the resumption of payments in specie by the other banks, was a poor commentary on the supposed advantages of such an institution as a regulator of the currency.

On the whole, Mr. Webster's project of curing the diseases of the currency, by subjecting it to the *regulation* of the General Government, has as little foundation in common sense and correct notions of political economy, as it has in the letter and spirit of the constitution of the United States. Let us next advert, for a moment, to the plan of Mr. Rives.

II. The *panacea* recommended by that gentleman is, that the revenue accruing to the General Government should be deposited, in the interval between its collection and disbursement, in certain State banks, to be selected by the Secretary of the Treasury for the purpose. Considered as a plan for the convenient, and especially the *safe*, keeping of the public funds, this proposition appears almost ludicrous, when taken in connexion with the recent universal explosion of the State banks, or, in the favorite language of the so-called conservative politicians, *institutions*, and the losses sustained in consequence by the Government. It will probably be a cause of wonder with future observers of the history of the present times, that a single individual of good sense and political experience,—not to say superior talents, which Mr. Rives certainly possesses,—should have had the courage, while the whole face of the country was still covered, as it were, with the smoking ruins occasioned by that explosion, to propose a renewal of the system which had brought it about. Still greater will be their astonishment, that the opposition, who, only four years before, had denounced this plan as fraught with every mischief, now, when their worst anticipations had been more than realized, should have gone in a body for its restoration. It is not, however, our present

purpose to dwell on the merits of Mr. Rives's plan, considered as a method of safely keeping the public funds, but to look at it merely in its operation on the general condition of the currency. The financial concerns of the Government are necessarily of so important a character, that the methods adopted for managing them must affect, to a considerable extent, the financial situation of the whole country. Mr. Rives appears to suppose that the present, or rather recent, unfortunate condition of the currency, was to be attributed to a want of confidence in the banks, and he recommends the renewal of the former system of depositing the public funds in these institutions, as the most effectual method of restoring this confidence, and with it a sound condition of the currency.

If these ideas were intended to be applied to the ordinary condition of the banks and of public opinion, they would be not merely incorrect, but directly the reverse of the truth. The ordinary state of public opinion in regard to the banks is that of excessive confidence, and all plans for the improvement of the currency must be predicated upon that supposition. But it should be remembered, in justice to Mr. Rives, that his theory was made known and probably matured in his own mind, at a time when it might have been supposed that the confidence commonly felt in the banks had been shaken by their recent simultaneous explosion, and that any measure which should tend to restore it would operate favorably upon the currency. In reality, however, the confidence felt in the banks was, even then, very little diminished, as was sufficiently shown, as well by the good humor with which the mercantile part of the community acquiesced in the suspension of payments, as by the facility with which payments have since been resumed. But the ordinary state of public opinion upon this subject, as has been already remarked, is that of excessive confidence in the banks, and this is, in fact, the prominent evil in the present banking system. It is precisely this excessive and universal confidence in bank paper,

which leads every one to receive it, without hesitation, as money, and gives it, in this way, the character of a circulating medium and measure of value, that does not properly belong to it. If a bank note were received merely for what it is, the promise of a trading company, instead of being employed to measure the value of other things, its own value would be measured in money, according to the known or supposed credit of the company issuing it, and it would fall into the mass of paper securities, where it properly belongs. The excessive confidence, which gives to the promise of a trading company the character of money, which does not belong to it, is the leading error in public opinion upon this subject. This again grows out of the implied sanction given to the banks by legislative charters, authorizing them to issue notes, as currency, and giving, indirectly, to these notes the endorsement of the State. But while public opinion remains as it is, it is quite apparent that any plan for the improvement of the currency, which proceeds upon the supposition of a general want of confidence in the banks, is entirely erroneous in principle, and, if acted on, would aggravate, instead of diminishing, all the existing evils.

III. Mr. Clay's plan is that of a National Bank, similar in its general character to the two which have already been established. His views and those of Mr. Webster are probably very nearly the same; but the latter, aware of the great and growing unpopularity of such an institution, deemed it more prudent to express himself in vague generalities. Mr. Clay, on the other hand, with the frankness natural to his character, toward the close of the second session of the late Congress, avowed himself a convert to the plan of a bank, which, in his earlier life, he had vehemently opposed; and he stated, somewhat in detail, the particular form and arrangements which he should prefer. The scheme is rather more plausible in the hands of Mr. Clay than in those of Mr. Webster. The former, by presenting it in a distinct and tangible

shape, is able to meet objections, while the latter, by covering himself under the mask of general principles, in themselves exceedingly questionable, instead of giving strength to his cause, leaves all the old objections standing, and adds a new list of his own creation.

The difficulty in the way of a National Bank, on the score of constitutional right and political expediency, is of so overwhelming a character, as almost to preclude the discussion of its economical influence. The power of establishing such an institution is not given to the General Government by the constitution, and is known to have been refused, when proposed in the convention by which the constitution was formed. The futility of the attempt to deduce such a power indirectly, from some more general clause, is sufficiently apparent from the variety of passages which have been resorted to for this purpose. If the power were, in fact, conferred in this way, there could be no difference of opinion among intelligent and fair men as to the passage containing the authority. So much for the objection of constitutional right. That of political expediency is, of possible, still stronger. The avowed object in establishing a National Bank is to control the whole currency of the country. If it fail to do this, it fails to effect the precise purpose for which it is instituted, and is of no value. But the power of controlling the currency is one of the most important departments of the sovereignty, far more important, in the present state of society, than the power of making war or raising money by taxes. Is it consistent with the democratic principle of the government, that this tremendous power should be exercised by the directors of a moneyed corporation, elected, virtually, for life, by the wealthy merchants of a few of the commercial cities? Would not a moneyed corporation, invested, in this way, with the power of controlling the currency, gradually draw to itself all the other powers of government, and thus change the character of our political institutions?

Experience shows but too clearly that such apprehensions are far from being chimerical. We have seen the last United States Bank, while the question of its re-charter was pending in Congress, distributing millions in loans among the members, and thus carrying its point by triumphant majorities in both Houses. When it was finally foiled in this attempt to renew its existence, by the firmness of General Jackson, we have seen it obtain a re-charter, under some slight change of name and form, by almost undisguised corruption, from the State of Pennsylvania. Having, by the terms of this arrangement, obtained possession, as trustee, of the notes which had been issued by the former bank, and paid in again, we have seen it re-issuing them under circumstances, which have since been declared by the government of the United States to constitute a criminal offence, punishable by fine and imprisonment in the penitentiary. Finally, we have seen this institution, after declaring publicly that it was the last to suspend payment of its notes in specie, and would be the first to resume, employing its immense influence, for months in succession, for a long time with too much success, to prevent other banks from resuming payment, and perseveringly refusing to concur in the measure, until actually driven into it by the indignant mandate of public opinion, enforced by the official injunction of its own State government.

In the face of these decisive objections, founded in the plainest considerations of constitutional right and political expediency, and sustained by uniform experience, it is hardly probable that a National Bank would ever be again established, however obvious and indisputable might be its advantages, considered merely under an economical point of view. In reality, however, we are very much inclined to question the great supposed advantages of such an institution in *regulating* the currency. The late United States Banks have been represented as producing this effect by regular settlements with the State banks, by which the amount of their notes paid into the United States

Banks, was returned upon them as often as once a week, and they were thus prevented from making excessive issues. It is obvious, however, that this result could only be effected to an extent corresponding with the amount of business done by the United States Bank, as compared with the amount done by the State banks. If, for example, the loans of the Bank of the United States, in this State, amounted to ten millions, and those of all the State banks were also ten millions, in that case the average amount of each, repaid in equal times, would be equal, and an excessive issue of notes, in either quarter, might be prevented. But this supposition is far from being a correct one. The aggregate of the business done by all the State banks in this State, for example, is from sixty to seventy millions; that of the branch of the United States Bank, when we had one, did not exceed three or four. The proportion between the aggregate capital and circulation of all the State banks, and those of the Pennsylvania United States Bank, according to the latest statistical returns, is nearly the same. The latter, therefore, would be able to check or regulate the issues required by one tenth part of the business done by the State banks, and no more. It could have, of course, no material influence upon the general condition of the paper money of the Union. Any single State bank, which should issue notes, to a very large amount, in a corrupt and fraudulent manner, would be checked in its career by the joint action of a National Bank and of the other State banks in its vicinity. But, for this purpose, a National Bank would be of no more use than any large State bank, and is not wanted. Nor is an occasional abuse of this kind by an individual bank,—although by no means an inconsiderable evil,—the essential vice of the system. This lies in the tendency to fluctuation of the whole mass of the paper currency, when issued on what are considered legitimate banking principles. A National Bank has no power to check this tendency, nor, if it had the power, would it feel the disposition.

It transacts about one tenth part of the banking business of the country, and of course can affect to that extent, and no further, the issues of the State banks. So far as it may or might affect them, it has no motive for endeavoring to restrain their issues within the point indicated by what are considered the usual principles of banking. It is constituted on the same principles, makes its profits in the same way, is affected by the same general causes, and conforms, in fine, in its operations, to the same general rules. It is, therefore, when considered under a merely economical point of view, nothing more than another immense bank added to the long list of the State banks, administered on the same principles, and fairly chargeable with its proportional share of responsibility for the mischiefs resulting from *the system*.

But even this is a far too favorable view of the practical operation of a National Bank. Both experience and theory show that such an institution cannot be regarded, in practice, under a merely economical point of view. National Banks always have been, and probably always would be, whenever and wherever they might exist, more or less connected with political affairs and party controversies. Independently of other disastrous consequences of such a connexion, its effect in aggravating the fluctuations of the currency has been, in past years, but too apparent to leave a doubt about what it would be in future. On the removal of the deposits from the late United States Bank, by General Jackson, the bank immediately curtailed its discounts to the extent of twenty millions, for the purpose, as was said, *of preparing to wind up its business*, although its charter had still more than two years to run. The State banks thought it necessary to curtail, in the same proportion. The result of the whole operation was the celebrated panic of 1833-4, which we owe, of course, entirely to the manœuvring of this pretended Regulator of the Currency. Finding that the President could not be frightened out of his policy, the bank, although the

termination of its charter was now one year nearer, forgot the necessity of *preparing to wind up its business*, and expanded its discounts again to an extent which they had never reached before. Whether this operation was calculated for the precise object of producing, after a while, by reaction, another *panic*, still more disastrous than the preceding one, or not, we will not undertake to affirm; appearances are certainly very much in favor of such a supposition; whether so intended or not, it unquestionably had that effect. The State banks, as usual, followed suit, and by the operation of these two causes, the paper bubble swelled at once to previously unexampled dimensions, and floated before the eyes of a half bewildered nation, glittering in all the gorgeous hues which the false lights of insane hope and wild speculation could spread upon its surface, until an early and fatal explosion demonstrated its emptiness. The suspension of the banks was the crisis that determined this explosion, for which, with all its fatal consequences,—although some other causes contributed to produce or aggravate them,—we are ultimately indebted to the perverse and inhuman policy of the United States Bank.

We have reason to believe, that the course pursued by the bank on that occasion opened the eyes of the people, more effectually than any argument could have done it, to the real dangers of such an institution; and, taken in connexion with the recent conduct of the same institution under its new name and charter,—to which we have already alluded,—would, were there no other objection, forever settle, in the negative, the question of establishing any new bank of the same description.

Much has been said, of late, of the great efficacy of a National Bank in regulating exchanges. This is, of course, an entirely different question from the effect on the currency, and the manner in which the two subjects have been confused and mixed up together by most of the opposition speakers throughout the

debates of the last Congress, shows, perhaps, as clearly as anything, the vagueness of their views upon the whole matter. Exchange is an order for the payment of money in another place, and can never bear a higher premium than the cost of transmitting the amount in specie. Between the most distant points of the Union this could never rise above from one to two per cent. When, therefore, we find the rate of exchange between the southwestern cities and New York quoted at from fifteen to twenty per cent., we see at once that the difference is merely nominal, and results from the depreciation of the currency in which the quotation is made. The remedy must be applied to the state of the currency, and not to the state of exchange. If a National Bank would have any effect upon the nominal rates of exchange, it would produce it by its influence not upon the real rate of exchange, but upon the currency in which the quotations are made. The only question, therefore, is the one already presented:—Would the establishment of a National Bank maintain the currency in a sound state? If it would, the nominal rate of exchange would always correspond with the real one, which, in all cases, regulates itself. If it would not, it would have no influence at all upon the rate of exchange, either nominal or real. The argument in favor of a National Bank, drawn from its supposed efficacy in regulating exchange, is, therefore, entirely foreign to the purpose, or rather only brings up indirectly in another shape the same considerations which are urged directly, and, consequently, with more force, in support of the utility of the institution in regulating the currency.

It is true, that a National Bank might operate as a great exchange broker, and, from its immense business and numerous ramifications, might produce some effect upon the rates of exchange, keeping them steady or making them fluctuate, as best suited its purpose. But, as it could derive no profit from the steadiness of these rates, and much from their fluctuation, it is easy to imagine in what way its influence would be exer-

cised. Its operation would, of necessity, be regularly unfavorable. Independently of this, it is no more the right, duty, or policy of the government of the United States to transact, directly or indirectly, the brokerage business of the country, than it is to enter into competition with the individual citizen as a cotton merchant or a cotton planter. Indeed, the late United States Bank has already, under its new name, assumed, in a covert shape, the former of these characters to an immense extent, and no reason can be given why it might not, with the same propriety, take the field as a cotton manufacturer, a timber merchant, or a whaler. In short, the only consistent form of carrying into effect this beautiful system, by which the Government is required to regulate, through a National Bank, the exchange or brokerage business of the country, would be to adopt at once the policy of the present enlightened ruler of Egypt, who, if we are rightly informed, is the only landholder, manufacturer, and merchant in his dominions.

The convenience of the notes of a National Bank, in making remittances and defraying travelling expenses, is often urged, in connexion with the subject of exchange, as an argument in favor of such an institution. But, unless the notes issued at one office are payable at all the rest, they would always bear a premium equal to the difference of exchange. But the bank, after undertaking, for a time, to make its notes payable indiscriminately at all its offices, wherever they might have been issued, abandoned the plan, and reduced its branches, in this respect, to the condition of local banks. It thus, as General Jackson correctly remarked in his first message on the subject, failed in effecting its supposed principal object, the establishment of a uniform currency. As the business of the bank has been generally transacted, its notes are no better for distant payments, in which paper is required, than bills of exchange; while, for current travelling expenses, specie, which can be had without a premium, is more convenient and safer than any kind of paper.

Thus, while the objections to a National Bank, founded in political considerations, are decisive and insurmountable, its supposed economical advantages, in regulating exchanges and the currency, appear to be entirely imaginary, since experience demonstrates, that, far from giving to the paper currency of the local banks any additional steadiness, it has been itself the main moving cause in the disastrous fluctuations of the last three or four years. On all accounts, therefore, a resort to this so much vaunted remedy for the diseases of the currency, is entirely inadmissible; and such, it is believed, is the full and unalterable conviction of the American people. The only other plan remaining to be noticed, is the one suggested by the President, and developed at length in his three successive messages at the opening of the three sessions of the last Congress.

IV. Mr. Van Buren's plan consists of two principal parts. He proposes, first, to leave the regulation of the State banks entirely to the States; and, secondly, to dispense with the use of banks, whether State or National, in collecting, keeping, and disbursing the revenue, and to employ, for these purposes, agents appointed by, and responsible to, the General Government.

Both these recommendations are so plainly consonant with common sense, that, a person unacquainted with the party controversies of the day, would probably wonder how there could be any dispute about them. That banks, established by the State Governments, should be regulated by them, and not by the General Government, seems to be a matter of course. It is equally clear, on the other hand, that the General Government ought to keep within its own control the funds, for which it is responsible to the people, and that they are not within its control, if they are placed in banks controlled by the State Governments. Considering the establishment of a National Bank as out of the question, the great propriety of a *separation of Bank and State*, so far as the finances of the General

Government are concerned, is apparent. The idea is carried out, in a wholly unexceptionable form, in the scheme commonly known as that of the *Sub-Treasury* or *Independent Treasury*. Yet this plan has been resisted by the opposition with a violence almost unparalleled in our political history, and, in consequence of some defection among the friends of the administration, has not yet, though proposed in three successive sessions, obtained the assent of Congress.

Regarded simply as a method of collecting, keeping, and disbursing the public revenue, the Independent Treasury scheme is entirely unobjectionable. It is the plain and obvious method of transacting the business; the same, which every individual habitually employs in managing his own concerns, and which all governments have employed from the creation of the world to the present day, with the exception of the brief period in this country since the establishment of the second United States Bank. An individual, who should entrust the care of collecting, keeping, and disbursing his income to a person, over whom he had no effective legal control, would be considered *non compos*, and put under guardianship. Shall the government of a great nation manage its pecuniary affairs with a degree of carelessness, which, in a private citizen, would be treated as insanity? The pretended objections which have been made to the Independent Treasury scheme are all of the most frivolous character, and, in some cases, obviously the direct reverse of the truth. *Increase of executive patronage*:—as if it were not apparent to every man of common observation, that the employment of banks, as the fiscal agents of the Government, affords facilities to the executive department for corruption and favoritism, which no other system would admit, and which are completely cut off by the *Independent Treasury*. *One currency for the Government and another for the People*:—as if the General Government, because it cannot prevent the depreciation of the notes of the State banks, ought not to endeavor, as far as possible, to prevent the

public treasury from suffering by it. *Bolts, bars, iron chests, and the dark ages*:—as if the public money would not be kept precisely in the same way in the vaults of a receiving office as in those of a bank. When we see objections, so manifestly frivolous, advanced by men of distinguished and acknowledged talent, we are tempted, at first, to doubt their sincerity; but the violence of party spirit will account for almost anything.

In addition to these positive objections, it has been objected, negatively, to the Independent Treasury bill, that it does not regulate the currency, that is, the issues of the State banks; and that, so far as it has any operation upon these institutions, it would aggravate rather than relieve the existing distress, by diminishing the confidence felt in them by the people. This objection proceeds upon the supposition, that it is the duty of the General Government to regulate the State banks, and that it is desirable that the confidence now felt in them by the people should be increased, or at least not diminished. We have already considered this supposition in both its parts. We have shown that the General Government has nothing to do with the regulation of the issues of the State banks; that the confidence of the people in these institutions, far from being deficient, is in ordinary times, and remained,—even under a suspension of payments,—excessive; and that this excessive confidence is the real root of the present disorders in the currency. This excess of confidence, again, results, as we have shown, from the sanction given to these institutions by the State and General Governments; by the former in legislative charters, and by both in receiving bank notes as money. By the effect of the Independent Treasury bill, this implied sanction, so far as the action of the General Government is concerned, would be withdrawn, and the credit of bank notes,—like that of all other paper securities,—would be left, as it ought to be, to regulate itself by the known or supposed solvency of the party issuing

them. The operation of the measure, in this respect, instead of being injurious, would be positively beneficial.

Its operation on the management of the State banks would be of the same kind. It would create an annual demand upon all these institutions, taken together, to the amount of the annual revenue of the General Government, that is, in ordinary times, of about thirty millions. In order to meet this demand, it would be necessary for each bank to keep on hand a somewhat larger amount of specie than they have generally kept, and to accustom itself to actual payments in specie. This change in their habits would be highly advantageous to the banks and to the public. The obligation imposed upon them by law to redeem their notes on demand in specie, is now regarded as merely nominal; in ordinary times, no specie is in fact demanded, and the banks, in transacting their business, make their calculations upon the supposition that none will be. The consequence is, that the slightest extraordinary occurrence, which tends to create such a demand, leads them to contract their accommodations, and produces a fluctuation in the currency. A constant necessity for regularly paying out specie, though to a very moderate extent,—say thirty millions annually, by eight hundred banks, upon a capital of three hundred millions, and a business of twice that amount,—would tend, so far as its operation went, to correct the existing evils, and to give to bank notes a little of the steadiness which is the essential and only indispensable requisite in a good measure of value.*

* Much has been said about the immense amount of specie which would remain unproductive in the hands of the Government, by the operation of the Independent Treasury system. This, like many other bugbears, may be disposed of by a few plain facts. The total capital of all the banks in the country, agreeably to the last returns, (see *American Almanac*, p. 115,) is 300,000,000, and the average amount of loans, taken at twice the capital, is, of course, 600,000,000. This sum, being loaned generally on notes running sixty or ninety days, is paid out and in, on an average, five times in the course of a year. The annual amount of payments each way is, of course

We have thus taken a hasty survey of the nature of the defects in the present state of the currency, and of the remedies that have been suggested for them, so far as the action of the General Government is concerned. We have endeavored to show, that the theory, which throws upon the General Government the responsibility of *regulating* the State banks, whether in the general form in which it is suggested by Mr. Webster, or in the more tangible shape of a National Bank, as proposed by Mr. Clay, is, on all accounts, inadmissible; that Mr. Rives's plan of depositing the public money in State banks, — independently of other objections to it, — by increasing the already excessive confidence of the people in these institutions, would aggravate, instead of curing, the evil; finally, that the plan of Mr. Van Buren is unexceptionable in both its parts: that the regulation of the State banks belongs, where he leaves it, to the State Governments; and that the Independent Treasury system, while it provides for the safe keeping and convenient collection and disbursement of the public money, will do, negatively, all the General Government can or ought to do, to correct the abuses of the State banks, and cure the existing diseases of the currency.

It is not pretended, however, by any one, that this plan or any other, within the constitutional action of the General Government, would administer an effectual and complete remedy to these disorders. The currency is issued by State banks, which can only be controlled and regulated by the State Governments.

3000,000,000. These immense operations employ about 150,000,000 in bank notes. The sum, annually collected and disbursed, as the revenue of the United States, may be taken at thirty millions, and, supposing the money used to be paid into and out of the treasury five times in the course of the year, — about a fair calculation, — would keep in motion, on the same principle, *two million dollars* in specie, of which *four hundred thousand* dollars, on an average, would be constantly on hand. Such is the actual amount of funds, which would remain on hand in an unproductive state, and which has been variously stated at *five, ten*, and even as high as *twenty*, and *five and twenty* millions. Even the President rates it at *five*.

In a future article we propose to consider the several plans that have been proposed for the improvement of the currency by the action of these Governments, and to suggest such additional measures as appear to us best suited to the purpose.

While we are writing these remarks, we learn from the public prints the retirement of Mr. Biddle from the presidency and direction of the United States Bank. As the occupant of these places he was a public man, and there can be no impropriety in terminating the present article with a few observations upon his public conduct.

Mr. Biddle's capacity and information as a financier or political economist, and his talents as a practical man of business, seem to us to have been overrated. His natural bent was for literature, and his first public labors were as editor of the *Port-Folio*. With this original disposition, we should have expected, that, after his attention was directed to finance as a professional pursuit, he would have mastered it as a science, and made known his conclusions in extended publications. Instead of this, we have almost nothing in print from Mr. Biddle, unless, indeed, the lucubrations of the *American Quarterly Review* and the *National Gazette* are to be traced to his pen. But even in these quarters we recollect nothing of sufficient attraction to excite public curiosity in regard to its authorship, with the exception of a single article in the *Review*, of great length and merit, upon the currency, which was immediately traced to Mr. Gallatin, and has since been avowed by him. This article, like everything else from the pen of Mr. Gallatin, exhibits, throughout, and in every line, the impress of an original master mind. His writings upon all subjects, but especially on finance, are evidently the works of a man who thinks for himself, and who thinks profoundly, clearly, precisely. Minds of this class are not very common. Mr. Biddle has given no reason to suppose that his is of the number. His acknowledged writings on financial subjects are, as we have said, very scanty,

and, such as they are, they certainly afford no indication of either just, clear, or original views in the writer. The most remarkable are his recent letters to Mr. Adams, and of these the most remarkable was the one of April, 1838, written for the purpose of preventing, if possible, the resumption of payment by the New York banks at the time determined by law. We will not enter into a minute criticism upon a paper, which failed entirely in its object,—which called forth at the time the marked disapprobation of the public, including a pretty large portion of the author's political associates and well-wishers,* and which is not important enough to have retained any hold on the public mind. We will only say, in general, that we hardly recollect a document, less creditable, in almost every respect, to the writer. It is written in a confused style, and the economical principles are incorrect and self-contradictory; but these, unfortunately, are not the worst faults in this composition. The recklessness, with which the author recommends the delay of specie payments, until the people shall be driven by distress to change the administration of the General Government, savors too much of the 'Torquemala spirit for a protestant financier of the nineteenth century. If anything could add to the singularity of such doctrine, it would be to see it addressed to a venerable statesman, like Mr. Adams, remarked for his rigid adherence, through all the shifting scenes of an active and stormy political life, to strict moral principle.

* A series of *piquant* and powerful articles, upon the policy of the United States Bank, as developed in the notorious April letter to Mr. Adams, appeared soon after in the Boston Courier, and were extensively republished and much noticed in other quarters. These articles were attributed to a source not very remote from the person of the venerable statesman to whom the April letter was addressed. The fact should have suggested to Mr. Biddle some doubts whether he was dealing fairly with the public in giving to his views, by the form in which he published them, the implied sanction of a gentleman who, in all probability, did not hold the same opinions.

If Mr. Biddle's qualifications as a political economist are of a very doubtful character, his practical course has not, we think, displayed any prominent talent as a financier. In ordinary times, we suppose that he is capable of administering successfully the concerns of a bank, whether large or small, although, as we mentioned above, he failed in his effort to make his notes payable at all the offices, and thus give the country a uniform paper currency. His hour of trial came on when the charter expired, and the means which he adopted to obtain a renewal were far from being honorable, either to his character or talent. Feeling, apparently, no confidence whatever in the merits of his case, or the justice of the people, he resorted, without scruple, to the most extraordinary and immoral means to effect his object. The attempt to intimidate General Jackson, by bringing on the question before his reelection; to corrupt Congress by the most lavish distribution of loans among the members, while the subject was pending; and to drive the people, by the distress and panic resulting from a sudden, enormous contraction in the issues of his bank, to concurrence in his views, are proceedings, concerning the moral character of which, there can hardly, we think, be two opinions. When the object had been frustrated by the firmness of the hero of New Orleans, and Mr. Biddle was endeavoring to obtain it, indirectly, by the aid of the State Government of Pennsylvania, we find him relying, as before, not on the merits of his case, and his own talent and address in presenting them forcibly in the proper quarter, but on corruption, indirection, and evasion of law. The open corruption of the Legislature,—the re-issue of the notes of the former bank under circumstances, which have since been declared by the General Government to constitute a criminal offence, punishable by fine and imprisonment in the penitentiary, and, last and worst of all, the untiring, persevering, we may almost say, agonizing effort, continued for more than a year, to perpetuate the distress of the

country by preventing the resumption of specie payments by the other banks, constitute a second series of measures, concerning which there is as little room for mistake as about the former one. In this enumeration we touch only the salient points, and leave entirely out of view minor irregularities, such, for example, as the contemptuous treatment of the committees of Congress under the first charter, and the evasion of the prohibition to deal in merchandise, under the second. Such, however, has been the course of the bank, alike in its operation on the largest, and the most limited scale. We feel the less scruple in describing them, as we have done, inasmuch as the moral obliquity of these proceedings is hardly disguised in the public communication of the directors. Mr. Biddle, in his April letter to Mr. Adams, distinctly states it as the policy of the bank to prevent the resumption of payments, in order to drive the people by distress, into a change of the administration.

Indeed, the tone adopted by the bank in the expositions and defences of its policy, which it has from time to time put forth through its various organs, is one of the most extraordinary features in their every way extraordinary proceedings. It consists of two elements: — *contempt of the Government of the country: — glorification of Nicholas Biddle.* Mr. Biddle is willing, after a certain period, to cease re-issuing the notes of the old bank, provided no law should be made to prevent it; *if there be, he will continue the practice in order to show his contempt of the Government.* The President, the Heads of Departments, and other high functionaries of the same class and character, figure in the Princeton address as convicted criminals, who have escaped from confinement, and whom the students are, in due time, to “scourge back to the penitentiary.” On the other hand, the money-making is the object, in all these publications, emanating, of course, indirectly or directly from himself, of unceasing and unmingled eulogy. “Calm as a summer’s morning,” he receives, in his marble palace, the daily

homage of admiring cashiers and *accommodated* editors, until, like the Macedonian madman in Dryden's ode, he seriously believes himself the supreme arbiter of good and evil fortune to the country.

“With ravished ears
The monarch hears,
Assumes the god,
Affects to nod,
And seems to shake the spheres.”

He regulates the currency, exchanges, and commerce of the Union; he carries the country triumphantly through the most dangerous crisis which it has ever experienced. Even the results, which he had most strenuously opposed, have been, nevertheless, in some unintelligible way, the effects of his agency. Thus, the resumption of specie payments by the banks, which he had been laboring for a year to prevent, and was finally driven into, against his will, by his own State Government, took place *in accordance* with his wishes and suggestions. Having settled the nation to his heart's content, he at length concludes to abdicate his control over commerce and the currency; and, accordingly, one fine morning, publishes a proclamation, addressed as usual to Mr. Adams, in which he informs him, that he means, in future, to attend to his own affairs and leave those of the United States to take care of themselves. We may perhaps venture to hope, that the States and the people, with such aid as they may obtain from Providence, will be able to make shift without the dictatorial superintendency of Mr. Nicholas Biddle.

All this, it is hardly necessary to add, is mere comedy, not to say broad farce, and the only wonder is, how a man of Mr. Biddle's character and experience can possibly suppose that it can be viewed in any other light. The delusion, under which he is laboring, reminds us of that of the astronomer in Rasselas, who supposed himself to possess a control over the weather. It is, in fact, precisely the sort of *monoma-*

nia, which Johnson intended to expose in that fine apologue; and so true is the picture to nature, that Mr. Biddle, in announcing his abdication, adopted, unconsciously no doubt, the same train of thought, and, in part, the same language, which are employed by the astronomer in resigning his power to Imlac.

“I have possessed, for five years, the regulation of the weather and the distribution of the seasons. The sun has listened to my dictates, and passed from tropic to tropic at my direction. The clouds, at my call, have poured their waters, and the Nile has overflowed at my command. I have restrained the rage of the dog-star, and mitigated the fervor of the crab. The winds alone of all the elemental powers have, hitherto, refused my authority, and multitudes have perished by equinoctial tempests, which I found myself unable to prohibit or restrain.

“I have administered this great office with exact justice, and made to the different nations of the earth an impartial *dividend* of rain and sunshine. What would have been the misery of half the globe, if I had limited the clouds to particular regions, or confined the sun to either side of the equator? But the life of man is short. The infirmities of age increase upon me; and the time will soon come when the *Regulator of the Year* will mingle with the dust.”

Substitute “regulation of the currency” for “regulation of the weather,” — one is about as much within the control of an individual as the other, — and we have here, almost *verbatim*, the essence of Mr. Biddle’s concluding epistle to Mr. Adams.

It is time, however, to draw to a close. We feel no particular pleasure in saying these things of Mr. Nicholas Biddle. We have no personal relations with him either for good or evil, — *nec injuriâ, nec beneficiis cogniti*. We believe him to be in private life a fair and honorable man, and entertain great doubts, whether he or any of his directors would imitate, in their conduct as individuals, the measures which they have adopted as a corporation. Should this be so, the fact

only places in a stronger light the mischievous operation of an institution, which can thus divert the upright course of individual action, and induce men of unexceptionable character to take part, as a body, in proceedings which, as individuals, they would all disavow and condemn.

ART. III. — THE KINGDOM OF GOD — *not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost.*

THE phrase, kingdom of God, and its corresponding phrase, kingdom of heaven, may be taken in two senses: 1. As designating the place or state of the blest after death; and, 2. That new order of things, which Jesus was sent to introduce and establish on the earth, and which men have attempted to realize by means of the church.

With the kingdom of God in the first sense, we have no great concernment. We know, and, while in the body, can know, but little of the world to come. We may make a thousand conjectures, devise a thousand schemes in relation to it, but all we can affirm with any tolerable degree of certainty is, that we shall live again, and be happy or miserable as we are good or evil in that new state of being.

Christianity is degraded, when its chief value is made to consist in teaching us how to die. God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. No man is or can be a true Christian, whose thoughts are always brooding over the tomb, and the destiny which awaits him beyond it. Sufficient to the day is the evil thereof. We should do our duty in this world, where our Creator has placed us, and leave our future life in the hands of God, where it belongs. Whoso prepares himself to live, need be under no apprehension, that he shall not be prepared to die.

Christianity teaches us how to die, I admit ; but it is to die as Jesus did, as the apostles did, in the righteous cause, martyrs to truth, to justice, to love, to man, to God. It enables us to die in the blessed hope of a glorious uprising ; but of the glorious uprising of the cause for which we have struggled, suffered, and now die, rather than of our individual selves. It is pleasant to die in the hope of a resurrection of the soul, and of its ascension to the Father ; but, to a rightly constituted mind, it is pleasanter yet to die in the hope, that, though overborne now, crucified, buried in the new tomb hewn from the rock, and guarded with armed soldiery, the cause for which we have lived, and which is dearer to us than life, is not lost forever ; that the third day shall dawn, when it shall burst the cerements of the grave, arise, clothed in shining garments, and, with a face as the lightning, triumphing over death and hell, and leading captivity itself captive. This is the death for which Christianity would prepare us, and this the glorious uprising, with the sweet hope of which, it would cheer and sustain us in poverty and humiliation, in exile, in the dungeon, on the scaffold, or on the cross.

The apostle, then, when he said “ the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,” did not, we may presume, understand by the phrase, kingdom of God, the place or state of the blest after death. He was not speaking of another world, of the condition of the soul hereafter, nor of the means of securing everlasting happiness. He must have used the phrase, then, to designate that new order, or the principles of that new order, of things, which Jesus was sent to establish on the earth.

This new order of things, called sometimes the Gospel kingdom, the kingdom of heaven on earth, is termed the kingdom of God, because God is its founder, the authority which obtains in it, and for whose glory it is established. The ordering, arranging, controlling of everything in this kingdom, was to be

in harmony with the divine will, and effected by the divine efficacy. It was, therefore, with strict propriety, denominated the kingdom of God.

This kingdom of God, this new order of things, was to be established on the earth. It was said of Jesus, —

“He shall not fail, nor become weary,
Until he have established laws in the earth,
And distant nations shall wait for his instructions.”

The angels, that announced his birth to the shepherds, professed to bring “glad tidings” to the earth, and the heavenly host, in their sublime chorus, shouted “peace on earth and good-will to men,” as well as “glory to God in the highest.” Though a divine, a heavenly kingdom, it was, then, to be built up in the world, and for men and women while in the flesh.

But this kingdom, though destined to be built up on the earth, was not of the earth, and must needs be diverse from all earthly kingdoms. Jesus said, “My kingdom is not of this world.” “Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things which are God’s.” But, if this order of things be rightly regarded as a kingdom; if it is to be a kingdom on the earth, and yet diverse from all earthly kingdoms, what can it be, but a new association, a new society, distinct from the civil society or the State, organized in a peculiar manner, with peculiar laws, institutions, ordinances, duties of its own? A kingdom of God, in a more refined and spiritual sense, could not be clearly comprehended or appreciated by the mass of the people, in the times of Jesus and his apostles. The kingdom of God on earth was, therefore, made to consist in a new organization of the human race, the formation of a new society, separate and distinct from the general society of mankind, and from the civil society or the State, — the formation of a spiritual, a religious corporation, in one word, the outward, visible Church.

This outward, visible society, the Church, must have its ordinances and duties, obedience to which shall constitute the purity and worth of its members ; and these must, from the nature of the case, be diverse from those enjoined by the State. For, should the Church enjoin the same duties as the State, it would be only a reduplication of the State, or the State under another name. But the State embraces, as far as a corporation can do it, the whole of man's moral and social duties. Whatever the Church enjoins, then, must be distinct from these. It has, therefore, uniformly taught, that a man, failing in the discharge of his duties churchward, will be eternally damned, though faithful in the discharge of every duty as a man and a citizen, or member of the body politic.

Salvation is possible only to the true Christian. The true Christian is a subject of God's kingdom. God's kingdom is the Church. Therefore, salvation is impossible to those who remain without the pale of the Church. He, who comes within the pale of the Church, but fails to demean himself as a worthy member, is no better than those who remain without. None can be saved even by joining the Church, if not obedient to its ordinances, and faithful in the discharge of the duties it imposes. It follows, then, that salvation can be attained only by faithfully observing the ordinances and duties of the Church. It follows, then, again, that by as much as salvation in the world to come is more desirable than mere earthly well-being, by as much as heaven is preferable to hell, by so much are the ordinances of the Church superior to the ordinances of the State ; by so much is a faithful and conscientious observance of the rites and ceremonies of the Church to be preferred to a faithful and conscientious discharge of our moral and social duties.

Now, what are these rites and ceremonies, these ordinances, duties, insisted on by the Church, and the observance of which constitutes our perfection in the eyes of the religious society ? Waiving what is peculiar to individual churches, or special communions,

and taking only what is common to all sections of the religious society, we may answer, that he, who professes a certain creed; is baptized; comes at stated periods to the communion; refrains from all labor, and, in some countries, from all amusement or recreation, on one day in seven; says his prayers, with or without bead-roll or book; attends regularly certain gatherings together of his neighbors on the first day of the week or oftener; contributes liberally towards defraying the expenses of the religious society; and, if the father of a family, teaches his children the infinite importance of all this, and brings them up to the conscientious observance of all this, is a perfect man churchward, and, according to the true theory of the church, an heir of salvation, of an inheritance that fadeth not away, eternal and incorruptible in the heavens.

Here, stripped of the poetic and mystic garb in which it is usually presented, is all that the Church, in its distinctive character, imposes or exacts. I say not that the Church insists upon nothing more, but this is all that it insists upon in its character of a society separate and distinct from civil society; all that it superadds to our moral and social duties; all it enjoins, not so far forth as it is one with the State, but so far forth as it is diverse from the State. The worth of the Church must consist, not in what it has or may have in common with other institutions, but in what it has peculiar to itself. What I have enumerated, constitutes, substantially, its peculiarity, the matters wherein it is different from the State, and which justify it in saying that it is not a kingdom of this world. These matters constitute its essence as a distinct corporation, and are all that render its separate existence necessary. Whatever else it may insist upon we could discharge, without assuming any relation which we did not bear as men and citizens before the Church was instituted.

Now, I will not say that these matters have no value. Many people have a world of tender associations clustering around them, and could not abandon

them without much self-denial ; but I must say, that, to make the kingdom of God consist in them, is very much like making it consist in meat and drink ; and I must be pardoned if I cannot see, in the founding of a kingdom, of which these are all that distinguish it, any extraordinary proofs of the wisdom and goodness of God ; if, indeed, I feel that a kingdom, which has nothing else to recommend it, was not worth the trouble of founding, was not worthy of Jesus, and is not worthy of us.

I speak not against the ordinances of the Church. I am aware of the respect which is due to the Church, and that trifles, when it enjoins them, cease to be trifles, and become matters of deep significance. I am aware, also, that there are many people who have no way of subduing their fear of the devil, but by a most punctilious observance of church rites and ceremonies, and I am willing that they should have rites and ceremonies, and as many as they please. I am not the man to ask them to neglect them, or to intimate that they ought to neglect them ; but in reverencing so profoundly, as they do, meats and drinks, I do insist that they should reverence for themselves, and not for others ; that they should not dare assert in the face and eyes of Jesus and his apostles, that these meats and drinks are the kingdom of God. In the kingdom of God circumcision availeth nothing, nor uncircumcision, but a pure heart. The true Christian, the true citizen of the commonwealth of Jesus, and subject of the kingdom of God, suffers no man to judge him in respect to meats and drinks, new moons, Sabbath days, or holidays. He values himself never on the possession of that righteousness, which comes from fidelity to the Church. He knows that, except his righteousness exceed that of the scribes and pharisees, he can in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven, or come under the reign of God. For him the handwriting of ordinances has been declared insufficient, and blotted out. Freed from the beggarly elements of a ceremonial law, he will not entangle himself again in the yoke

of bondage ; having begun in the spirit, in truth, justice, love, he will not be so foolish as to believe that baptism and the Lord's supper can perfect him.

The kingdom of God must be but an insignificant affair, if it be not something altogether different from an outward, visible, religious society, called the Church, or even the principles which serve as the basis of such a society, or of the duties it enjoins. A drug, bad in itself, may do good by expelling a disease which is worse ; and so the Church has done good, and perhaps was a useful, as it was an inevitable institution. But in the actual state of things, it is a chief obstacle to the extension and upbuilding of God's kingdom on the earth. It could have been no part of the original design of Jesus to found it, and if he has tolerated it, it has been as Moses tolerated divorce, on account of the intractableness of men's hearts, not because it was intrinsically good, fitted to be a definitive institution for mankind.

There was nothing in the preaching nor in the life and manners of Jesus, that indicated the necessity of forming, for the realization of the kingdom of God, a peculiar society, distinct from the State and the general society of mankind. He never separated himself from his countrymen. He mingled with them as a brother and as a fellow-citizen. No outward observance distinguished him. He affected no singularity or eccentricity. He ate, drank, dressed like the rest of his countrymen ; attended their festivals, their merry-makings, their weddings, and their funerals. To all outward appearance, he was a simple, unostentatious Jew, distinguished solely by the purity, worth, and sublimity of his life and conversation. His divine Sonship manifested itself only in the fact, that he possessed truth and love without measure, and that these reigned in him with absolute authority. As were these divine principles in Jesus, so should be the kingdom of God in the world.

The kingdom of God is an invisible kingdom, the

dominion of godly influences and divine principles. Whatever partakes of the power of God, must be invisible save in its effects. God himself is invisible. He is the unseen Efficacy, the invisible Life, of which we and nature are but the manifestation. "*Mundus universus nihil aliud est, quam Deus explicatus*," says an old author. The universe is nothing else but God expressed. We see around us visible nature, the sun, the moon, stars, land, water, trees, plants, flowers, animals; but these are only parts of the shadow of the unseen God. They are not ultimates, nor sufficient for themselves. They depend on something which they are not, and are subjected to a law which is over them. This something on which they depend, this law to which they are subjected, is that which men term Nature, but, in reality, it is God. We look into what we call the moral world, and there again we see a variety of facts, but they are no more ultimates than the facts of external nature; no more sufficient for themselves, and have the same need of something which they are not, on which to depend, and are subjected to a law which is over them. This something, this law, is the spiritual face of the Deity, or God as expressed by the spiritual world.

Men are apt to regard these two manifestations of the Deity somewhat in the light of a manifestation of two different orders of Life or Being; but a sublime philosophy identifies them, and proves that it is one and the same Life which flows through the natural world, and the moral. Spirit and matter are but the two faces of the self-living Life, from whom all life proceeds, and who is called by us God, or the good. Spiritualism and materialism, when we have risen to the true conception of the Christian faith, are swallowed up in the unity of Absolute Life. But people generally stop, and must stop, far below this sublime height. We are rarely able to trace all the streams back to their primitive source, and unify them in the exhaustless Fountain of the Divinity.

We therefore take each stream to be complete in

itself; think and speak of it as manifested by a particular class of facts, without undertaking to trace it to its source. Thus we go into the external world to study its phenomena, and we name all the forces we find at work there, not according to their nature and origin, but according to the special facts they respectively present. Hence, we speak of gravitation, magnetism, electricity, contraction, expansion, as separate and independent powers or causes, although each class of facts, which we have observed, is produced by the direct agency of God, by the Divine Efficacy itself. The terms we use serve merely to designate the Divine Efficacy, viewed simply as the cause of these several classes of facts. These facts we see; the cause, the power, which reigns in them, we do not see; but that cause, however variously it may be named, is one, and is God.

We do the same in the moral world. We isolate the powers we find there, regard them as independencies, and name them according to their respective effects. Thus we speak of truth, justice, beauty, love, without reflecting that the efficacy we recognise in these is the Divine Efficacy, and that truth, justice, beauty, love, are only so many different terms for designating the Deity, contemplated solely as the principle of certain phenomena of the moral world. But here, as in outward nature, the dominion of God is silent, invisible, save in the facts which express it. It is not an outward, visible dominion. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth." So is the dominion of God.

Now since, owing to our imperfection, we are under a sort of necessity of viewing the Deity, if I may so speak, in parts, and these parts themselves, to a great extent, as wholes, we shall best understand the kingdom of God, by declaring it to be the dominion of those principles which we term godlike or divine. The dominion of moral principle is, in the last analysis, the dominion of God. The reign of moral princi-

ples, then, is the reign of God. These principles may be variously named, but I include them all under the terms, Truth and Love. The efficacy we name Truth and Love is the Divine Efficacy. The empire of truth and love, then, is the empire of God.

I touch here a point of some importance. People do not, generally speaking, admit that truth and love are God manifest, or God viewed under a spiritual aspect. They deny, that truth and love, wherever found, are one with God. They thus deny, did they but know it, that God manifests himself in the flesh or in the world. And here is that denial of what is called the doctrine of the Trinity, which is regarded as the virtual denial of Christianity itself, and the most fatal heresy into which men can fall. The doctrine of the Trinity has been contended for more earnestly than any other doctrine the Church has ever put forth. The Church has never been able to treat those who deny the Trinity as Christians. The denial of this doctrine has been almost universally felt to be a rejection of Christianity. This feeling has been just, and is that which, more than anything else, redeems the Church from utter reprobation. But, notwithstanding this, the Church has never comprehended the deep significance of the symbol it has adopted and contended for. It has worshipped the symbol; and even while prostrating itself in devout adoration before it, it has anathematized the Idea, disowned the God it should have seen through it. Truth and Love have been isolated from their sources, and, though admitted to be very respectable, they have been denied to be the Eternal God. Jesus is a worthy man, and deserving of sincere respect, but is not God; Love is a good and sweet influence, and much to be desired, but not God. So have men felt, and so feel they still. Hence, they are unable to identify the kingdom of God with the kingdom of Truth and Love. Though these reign supreme, something more is thought to be requisite to constitute the veritable kingdom of God. Here is the grand error of the Church.

John assures us that the Word, which was made flesh, was in the beginning with God, and was God. And what was the Word, but Truth, truth eternal, immutable, and universal. "I am," says Jesus, "the Way, the TRUTH, and the Life." "I and my Father are one;" for, "I proceed forth and come from the Father." What can more clearly establish the identity of Truth with God, their absolute oneness? "He that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him, for God is love." What more do we ask to convince us of the identity of Love with God, of their absolute oneness? If Truth and Love be one with God, then should we honor them even as we honor God, and honoring them is honoring God. "The time shall come," says Jesus, "when men will honor the Son even as they honor the Father;" and truly, because the Son is one with the Father, is the Infinite God, as manifest, under a moral aspect, to human beings. If, again, Truth and Love be one with God, their dominion must be the dominion of God, and the kingdom of God resolves itself into the kingdom of Truth and Love, and must be built up just in proportion as Truth and Love come to exert their legitimate empire over men's minds and hearts.

We know God but as he reveals himself. No man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son reveals him. It is in the face of his Son, his manifestation, that we behold his glory. Admit that the glory we see in the face of the Son is the glory of God, then it follows, that we can see and know the glory of God; so, also, admit that Truth and Love are God manifest, God revealed, we then can know God, and comprehend the principles of his kingdom. Deny that Truth and Love are God, deny their absolute oneness with God, and we cease to have any clear conceptions of God. The word God becomes an empty name, and his kingdom a dream. This is wherefore it is necessary to insist on the identity of Truth and Love with God. We know something of these; consequently, when we are told, that the king-

dom of God consists in the reign of these, we comprehend what is meant. But if we are told, that Jesus Christ came to found the kingdom of God ; that we must labor for the upbuilding of that kingdom ; and are not told, at the same time, that this means laboring to build up the kingdom of Truth and Love, we can understand nothing of what is said to us, nor of what is the work we are called upon to perform ; and, therefore, shall be as likely to labor against God as for him or with him. In Jesus Christ, God descends to men, manifests himself to their apprehension ; in declaring the kingdom of God to be the empire of Truth and Love, we bring it down to men's intellectual capacities, enable them at all times to recognise it, and to labor understandingly for it.

At first sight, some persons, who shall take in but a part of my meaning, may imagine that the doctrine here set forth is very generally believed, and may wonder where I have lived, that I have judged it necessary to maintain so elaborately a point which no Christian will dispute ; but, if I am not much mistaken, the members of the religious society are far from generally admitting, that the kingdom of God is nothing more nor less than the reign of the great moral principles I have pointed out. Religious people do, by no means, take so high and so rational a view of that order of things, which it was the purpose of the mission of Jesus to establish. They are now in very nearly the same situation they were in at the time of Jesus and his apostles. They preach the law of works, by the deeds of which can no flesh be justified. They do not measure the growth of God's kingdom by the progress of truth and love ; nor do they estimate the Christian worth of a man by his pure love for all God's creatures, the earnestness with which he seeks for truth, the boldness and energy with which he utters it, and the fidelity with which he obeys it. Something more is demanded, infinitely more important than all this. Certain meats and drinks are

insisted on as the indispensable condition of salvation. It is thought to be altogether more *religious*, to be faithful to the Church, than it is to be faithful to our own honest convictions, and the dictates of our own consciences. We may seek with the greatest pains for truth, and make it the business of our lives to discover and promulgate it; we may seek the welfare of our race with a pure and warm heart, with a love that never tires, which shrinks from no obstacles, is discouraged by no difficulties, and appalled by no dangers, and yet be doomed by religious people to the nethermost hell, if we chance to fail in our respect to the Church, or if we show the least disgust at the miserable mummerly it would make pass for the worship of God. So far, in point of fact, are religious people from admitting the great doctrine I am laboring to bring out, that I shall be much surprised if they do not term me an infidel, and regard me as an enemy to both God and man, for asserting it. Is there, then, no need of reiterating the doctrine of the apostle, that "the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost"?

It is not my wont to look upon the dark side of things; and I generally seek, in men and institutions, the good rather than the evil, for I take no pleasure in convicting those of folly or error, who are linked to me by a common nature, and whose lot is bound up with my own, and which, — be it what it may, — I am willing to share; but I confess I am weary of this heartless worship to God, with which men seek to purchase his favor and the eternal bliss of heaven. I look around me for relief, for something which rational and immortal beings may with propriety offer to their Creator, and which he may deign to accept; but I look in vain. Where is the man, believing himself, and by others admitted, to be a Christian, who places the worship of God in a heart alive to the wants and well-being of Humanity, in sincere love of truth, firm adherence to lofty principle, and in untiring philan-

thropic efforts? Where is he? Among the clergy, studiously shunning to say aught that may startle the consciences of respectable sinners, and afraid of uttering the truth in earnest, in that tone of deep sincerity which would indicate that they believe it, and feel that it ought to be obeyed, lest, perchance, they be thought to violate good taste, and detract from the dignity and decorum of the pulpit? Among the men of profligate lives, base feelings, and grovelling propensities, calling themselves Christians, and flattering themselves that all will be well with them, because, forsooth, they belong to the Church, and “pay tithes of anise, cummin, and mint”?

The world lieth in wickedness. Man, vulture-like, preys upon man. Great social wrongs obtain. The immense majority of the human race are slaves, “hewers of wood and drawers of water” to the few; chained down in abject poverty, and, what is worse, in hopeless ignorance, — doomed to vegetate and die, without one glimpse of the noble capacities with which God created them, and the kindling destiny for which he made them. Armed soldiery are everywhere ready to fly, wherever the people are beginning to feel the workings of a higher nature, in order to suppress every effort the struggling peasant, wronged for countless ages, may make in behalf of liberty and the imprescriptible rights of man. The friends of progress are jeered, neglected, or persecuted; the advocates of new views of truth, — views, in which is contained the future destiny of our race, — men of pure hearts, free and energetic minds, are treated as the enemies of God and society; laws are enacted which tend to perpetuate factitious distinctions and hoary abuses; government, almost everywhere, is made an instrument of oppression, strengthening the strong and abandoning the weak. And what are they doing who claim to be the exclusive subjects of God’s kingdom? Mourning, it may be, over a breach of the Sabbath; settling a disputed point in Hebrew geography; ascertaining how much falsehood it is necessary to uphold, in order to

keep the lower classes in submission ; kindling fanatical excitements, which shall spread over the land and leave moral desolation in their train ; robbing the poor sempstress or the poor housemaid, to obtain the means of sending out tracts and missionaries to convert the heathen to creeds, which have long since ceased to find believers among the intelligent at home ; going to the temples to thank God that they have been plucked as brands from the burning, and are now holier than others ; saying their prayers ; singing psalms ; damning infidels and heretics ; — at best, “ straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel.”

The world lieth in wickedness ; and what is the Church doing ? Flattering the sinner with vain promises, and lulling his conscience asleep, or awakening it to that which is not sin ; feeding us with manna, whereof a man may eat and die, not with the bread of life, which comes down from heaven, and whereof if a man eat he shall live forever ; baptizing us with water, it may be, but not with the spirit, not with the Holy Ghost and with fire ; for truth, giving us unintelligible creeds ; for love to God and man, sectarian zeal and blind devotion to the Church ; for a true, a spiritual righteousness, a superstitious reverence for cant phrases, unmeaning rites and ceremonies, which deaden the heart, stultify the intellect, and enervate the hands. Is there, then, no need of insisting upon the great truth, that the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but the reign of holy principles, the absolute dominion of truth and love ? There is need ; and well were it for the human race, would God raise us up another Luther to denounce dead works, and proclaim salvation by faith alone ; another John Knox, to wield the battle-axe of the Lord, to attack the old rotten Church, and let in daylight through the roofs of the old temples desecrated by a heartless and idolatrous worship ; new and bold reformers, who will speak out to the slumbering conscience of christendom, and, like the staunch old German monk, not fear to throw their inkstands in the devil’s face, and send his satanic majesty back howling to hell

Truth does not reign, nay, its right to reign is denied. Grave divines, and most learned doctors, ask for a higher sovereign than truth, and will not allow truth to act even as vice-sovereign, till various signs and wonders have verified its commission. They ask for miracles to authorize them to call goodness goodness, and love love; and, such is the grossness of their minds, that they can see the verification which they needlessly ask for, only in the strong wind, the fire, the earthquake, or in some marvellous display of power over outward nature. They see no God in an act of heroism, of self-sacrifice, of disinterested love; hear no God in the still small voice which speaks to the heart, subdues the soul, and brings tears to the eyes. They see no God in the love Jesus had for man, stronger than death; no divinity in his life of self-denial, of continued sacrifice for the redemption of man; no truth in the generous lessons he inculcated, in the sublime doctrine he taught of God, of man, the human soul and its destiny, and of which his life was a lucid commentary; and, like the wicked and adulterous Jews of old, they demand a sign, a wonder, a miracle, to prove that that doctrine is truth; that it is authoritative, legitimate, and that they may venture to receive it under their protection, and insist on its being obeyed. Is there a worse infidelity than this? a more fatal blindness than this, which prevents them from seeing that truth is truth the world over, that truth everywhere is the word of God, which was in the beginning with God, which was God, and is God, and therefore possessing a native and inherent right to absolute dominion?

Even these same grave divines and most learned doctors deny not only the authority of truth, but they deny the Holy Ghost. They seem not to have heard even so much as that there is a Holy Ghost. Jesus promised to send us the Comforter, who should be ever with us, console us by his presence, and lead us into all truth. But they disown the Comforter; and when we tell them Jesus has been as good as his

word, that the Comforter has come, that he abides with us, bringing to our remembrance the words of Jesus, and unfolding to our hearts and understandings their deep significance, they stare at us in utter surprise and amazement; and no sooner do they recover themselves a little, than they denounce us as the setters forth of strange Gods, than they look upon us as mad, and in need of physic and good regimen, or as desperately wicked, and in need of stripes, bonds, and imprisonment. We are told flatly, that what we allege cannot be true; that the Holy Ghost we speak of is mere carnal reason, which to follow is death spiritual and eternal, and that Jesus never promised to send us the Comforter, who should lead us into all truth; that he merely promised him to some dozen men or more, who lived a long while since, and that we have nothing to do but to learn what he led those dozen men or more to record for our instruction; to yield that the assent of our understandings and the homage of our obedience. Well was it said, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit, lest he depart from you."

The scribe, well instructed, is grateful for all past records of the revelations of God to man, and he studies them with the docility of the child, and the reasoning powers of the man. He is every day more and more penetrated with a sense of their inestimable value, and of the necessity of becoming familiar with the deep meaning they contain. But he has learned that God's revelations, however made, have a like character; that they are all the revelations of the same God, and contain far more than meets the eye of the careless observer. Nature has her secrets, which no eye has ever yet detected, and the "written word" conceals truths, which no human intelligence has grasped, of which no one has, as yet, the faintest conception. The universe round, about, above, and within us, is written all over with hieroglyphs, full of deep significance. By-gone ages have spelt out and interpreted a few, as best they could; but are there no more to be spelt out and interpreted? Is there

nothing but empty space beyond that narrow horizon which bounds our vision, or has the human mind attained its ultimate limits ?

In this same universe, of which we have learned so little, and of which, with all the knowledge we have inherited from our fathers, we know so little, there lie embedded, like seeds in the earth, truths of which the past had no foresight, no forefeeling, and in which are folded up the future destinies of our race ; but where is the seer who may behold them, or who, if beholding them, may, even in this age of boasted light and liberality, when it is pretended the kingdom of God is established on the earth, point them out to the ardent seeker, urge the necessity of attempting their cultivation, or rejoice in their development and growth, without being denounced — as was Jesus — as a blasphemer, as an enemy to truth and righteousness, by the very persons who are loudest in praise of Jesus, in magnifying his name, and making honorable mention of his life, deeds, sufferings, and death for the redemption of man ? And where shall we find even now a community, in which a man may live according to the eternal truth and fitness of things, regarding all things as they are intrinsically good or evil, without reference to conventional creeds and usages, and not be laughed at, doomed to neglect, to poverty, to beggary, to starvation, or to be prosecuted as a criminal ? And where, again, is there a community, in which there are not multitudes passing for good Christians, nay, believing themselves good Christians, who patronize every popular scheme of piety and benevolence, and yet who believe doctrines they never broach, uphold, in word and deed, doctrines they inwardly abhor, and leave him who comes to them, in the name of Jesus, with the very doctrines they believe and secretly rejoice to see prosper, to tread, as did his master, the winepress alone ; men who speak not, act not as they believe, lest they lose reputation, their position in society, or, like the Son of Man, have not where to lay their heads ? So long as this is the case, who will have the

hardihood to assert, that the Church is identical with that new order of things which Jesus came to institute, that it is generally admitted that the kingdom of God is the simple moral dominion of truth and love, that the Holy Ghost is a reality, and the Comforter promised us is actually in the world, abiding with us, and both able and willing to lead us into all truth ?

The great doctrine I wish to bring out and establish is, that the kingdom of God is neither more nor less than what we mean by the moral dominion of truth and love ; and, therefore, in order that we may be true subjects of that kingdom, truth and love must be supreme within us, inspire all our undertakings, authorize all our deeds, and shape our whole lives. This is the great, the central truth of Christianity, around which all its minor truths cluster, towards which all its teachings and influences tend, and in which they find their unity. This is the great truth, hitherto but dimly seen, and scarcely conceived of by the great mass of professed Christians, which it is of the utmost urgency that we bring out and insist upon, if we desire to promote the growth of God's kingdom, either in ourselves or in the world. Religion suffers more than any of us can easily imagine, from the obscurity in which this truth is left. Not a few in this age, and they not the least enlightened nor the least well-disposed, have outgrown the old forms in which religion has been clothed, become incapable of perceiving any intrinsic vitality or power in what the Church urges as the essence of divine worship ; and, confounding as they do, but as they should not, the Christianity of Christ with the Christianity of the Church, suspect everything which bears, or can be supposed to bear, the name of religion, and who must soon forego faith in God, in man, in virtue, in goodness, become hostile or indifferent to all spiritual matters, sink down into a debasing sensualism, cease to regard the noble faculties with which they are created, the lofty destiny to which they have a right to aspire, and seek to fill up the void in their hearts, or to save themselves from

the weariness which comes over them, by sensual indulgence or the vain pursuit of worldly wealth or honors. Man without religion is a wretched animal. He has nothing to exalt his sentiments, refine his affections, or to create within him that burning enthusiasm, without which he can neither effect his own good nor that of his race. It is to the want of this enthusiasm, this moral exaltation, which only religion produces, that we must attribute that unfruitfulness we deplore in so many fine and highly cultivated minds in every community. Even among the ministers of religion, I grieve to say, we find many who spend their lives in utter unprofitableness. They preach to us, indeed, but their discourses are barren, written without warmth or vigor, and delivered in a lifeless manner and a listless tone. They are not deficient in natural endowments; their motives, so far as they have motives, are not bad; their manners in private life are amiable; their conversation is sometimes even instructive, and always entertaining: but their ministry makes no impression; it passes away and leaves no trace behind, save the sorrow of a few friends, who had looked for something better. They are men without a future. Wanting faith, they want employment. They see nothing to be done, nothing they can do; and feeling their inability to accomplish anything, if they chance to undertake something, it is necessarily with so much doubt and misgiving, so much feebleness and indifference, that utter failure is the inevitable result. I never see one of these ministers of religion, but I am touched with a profound sadness. Angels are they, dismissed from paradise, and doomed to eternal idleness. Why shall so much private worth, so many brilliant talents, so many rich acquisitions, lie waste forever, and yield no fruit for their possessor, nor for the world? The evil is a great one, and can be removed but by making it undeniably evident that religion appeals to man's whole nature, and has employment for the intellect and the moral sense, as well as for the affections purely pious; but by frankly

admitting and earnestly contending, that we promote religion and build up the empire of God, just in proportion as we discover and promulgate truth, obey truth, and promote good will from man to man. It is a fearful infidelity, this to which I allude, and I know no way to cure it, but by bringing out the great truth for which I contend, and making it seen and felt that the kingdom of God is no separate and foreign kingdom, but connected with all that we know, feel, and crave of truth and love, in some one or all of their manifold relations with the human soul, human thought, human duty, and human life.

Assuming the kingdom of God to be what I have asserted, we can easily understand what we must do in order to build it up on the earth. We must seek for the truth, truth under all its aspects, in all its relations, as for hid treasure; and, having found it, we must value it as the pearl of great price, hold it fast, and suffer neither angels, nor principalities, nor life, nor death, nor things present, nor things to come, nor any other creature, to separate us from it. To do this, may require us to dissent from the world and from the Church even; to forego all the pleasures of friendship and society; to stand alone in the midst of those we love; to be pointed at as singular, mad, or depraved, by those to whom our hearts yearn, and for whom we would willingly die; but what then? Shall we suffer such things to move us? Let us rather remember, that Jesus was once a stranger in the world; that he stood alone in the multitude; that of the people none were with him, not one responded to the warm affection of his heart; not one understood his purpose, appreciated his motives, or did justice to his disinterestedness and self-sacrifice; that he went about doing good, lightening the load of the weary and heavy laden, healing the sick, comforting the mourner, opening the eyes of the blind, unstopping deaf ears, and making the dumb sing and the lame leap, when he himself had not even where to lay his head.

Nor is it enough to uphold truth in general. It is necessary to seek out and adhere firmly to the particular truth most needed by our own age and country; and this is always the truth which has not yet risen to empire, the truth which is the least popular, the least understood, in behalf of which the fewest voices are heard, and, therefore, the truth which it is the most dangerous to assert. There is no merit in echoing the truth which everybody shouts, and which, for the reason that everybody shouts it, must needs be exerting all its legitimate influence. In this world, all things change their forms. The watchword of yesterday is not the watchword of to-day. Once it was a cross, a self-denial, a self-sacrifice, to enrol one's self among the followers of Jesus; for, once, not many mighty men, not many noble, not many rich and honored owned him for their master; but now it is fashionable, and accounted honorable even to join the Church and profess Christianity. The cross, the self-denial, self-sacrifice is now, therefore, in standing aloof from the Church, in maintaining individual independence, and bringing up and insisting on those truths the Church neglects. Truth in itself is immutable, but its aspects are perpetually shifting; and, in this sense, even truth may be said to change. The truth which reigns to-day is not the truth which must reign to-morrow. Great and glorious as may be the actual sovereign, he shall give way to a successor. Instead, then, of basking in the sunshine of the court, and seeking to share its largesses, we must go among the carpenters, the blacksmiths, and fishermen, and find out him that is born to be king, though lying in a manger, — bind ourselves to his cause, follow him in his humiliation, and share his poverty and reproach. We must seek out the neglected truth, the truth which nobody sees, or which nobody speaks well of, and wed ourselves to it, for better or for worse, live and labor, or suffer and die for it, till it be raised to empire and glory.

This principle will lead us always to take our stand

with the weak, to aid those who need aid, and not to do as the world, which seeks always to be on the side of the strong, and to aid those who are abundantly able to aid themselves. The Christian will rarely be found on the side of power. His post is always the post of danger, never that of safety. He leaves the "better sort," who, we have been told, on high authority, are not dependent on Divine Providence for support, and espouses the cause of the poor and friendless. He does not wait till that cause has become popular, before he espouses it; but he weds himself to it when it is in the lowest repute, when the rich, the great, the fashionable, the learned, despise it and load it with reproach, call an enemy to God and society, him who dares speak well of it. They, who have no one to speak for them, to plead their cause, who cannot speak for themselves, who are commanded to be silent in their own behalf on pain of being branded as incendiaries, and punished as malefactors, are they who for him are the people of God, whose cause is the cause of truth and love, which he must espouse, and for which he must dare to live or dare to die. In all revolutionary struggles, he takes sides with the unprivileged many, the great Unwashed, as somebody calls them, and braves the wrath of kings, nobilities, and hierarchies. When the interested few, who fatten on the sweat and blood of their brethen, and ride rough-shod over human rights and human affections, in a moment of panic, cry out "ORDER," "RIGHTS OF PROPERTY," he cries out, in still louder tones, "LIBERTY," "RIGHTS OF MAN!" and in tones, too, which fetch their echoes from afar, ring on the oppressor's heart as a summons from God to judgment, and in the souls of the wronged, the enslaved, the down-trodden, as the jubilee-shout of deliverance. The cause of the suffering sons of toil, who, from time immemorial, have been made mere drudges, debarred from all the sweets of existence, and doomed to be brutes, as the price of being governed, of being kept in order, and from cutting one another's throats, save at their keepers'

pleasure, is for him the cause of God ; and to blaspheme that cause or its friends is to blaspheme the Holy Ghost, to commit the unpardonable sin ; and to wish to impede its progress, or to embarrass the operations of its friends, is to wish to impede the progress of the eternal God, and to retain the earth under the accursed dominion of the devil and his angels.

The kingdom of God, it follows from what I have said, is identical with no special society, no outward, visible corporation, with no church creed or usage. It lies back and above all forms of faith and worship, in the soul itself, and is a power within us, which renders whatever comes forth from us pure and holy.

This great truth must be brought out and insisted upon ; it will check bigotry and intolerance, exchange sectarian wrangling for an honest and earnest pursuit after truth, put down speculative infidelity, not by showing that no truth but religious truth is to be accepted, but that all truth, of whatever name or tendency, is religious ; by showing that no man, who believes in truth and love, is or can be an atheist, whatever he may call himself or be called by others ; and that every man, who loves his neighbor as himself, seeks earnestly for the truth, and obeys the truth so far as he sees it, is a Christian, in the only worthy sense of the term, whether he be called Jew or Pagan, Mahometan or Infidel. The dispute about forms of worship will end, because when it is understood that the kingdom of God consists in truth and love, all that passes or can pass for external worship will be seen to be without intrinsic value, and to be worthy of regard, only so far forth, as it exalts the sentiments, purifies the affections, and collects a moral force in the soul, which shall make it ready and able to do the biddings of truth and love, without fear or favor. Let the great doctrine I have contended for be brought out and firmly established, and the Church, really universal, will be built up, not by bringing all men into a special society called the Church, but by diffusing truth and

love through all hearts, and making them the basis of the State, and of all social institutions. The State will then be holy, religious, because it will be organized and administered in accordance with the immutable truth of things, the will of God, and the nature and wants of man. This is the grand result contemplated in the mission of Jesus; and this is the grand result for which all the saints pray, which all God's prophets predict, and for which all who love God and man labor without ceasing.

ART. IV.—RIGHTS OF WOMAN.*

Desd. What praise wouldst thou bestow upon a deserving woman? One, that in the authority of her merit, did justly put on the very vouch of malice itself?

Iago. She, that was ever fair and never proud,
 Had tongue at will, and yet was never loud;
 Never lack'd gold, and yet went never gay,
 Fled from her wish, and yet said, 'Now I may';
 She, that being angered, her revenge being nigh,
 Bade her wrong stay, and her displeasure fly;
 She that could think, and ne'er disclose her mind,
 See suitors following, and not look behind;
 She were a wight,—if ever such wight were,—

* * * * *

To suckle fools, and chronicle small beer."

I HAVE introduced the foregoing portion of a conversation upon the character of woman, between the gentle, devoted, trustful Desdemona, and the dark, sarcastic, and subtle Iago, because it embodies the opinions of probably a vast majority of that portion of the human creation, which is called, by distinction and preëminence, *man*. It serves me as a text for a

* We insert this paper on the Rights of Woman, contributed by a friend, with much pleasure, because it seems to us a clear and forcible statement of the side of the question it espouses. We, ourselves, are, for the present, "non-committal" on this subject. — ED. B. Q. R.

discourse upon the rights, duties, and proper sphere of woman. On the text itself, I shall make but a single comment. Shakspeare has put this disparaging estimate of woman into the mouth of Iago, a thorough, soul-grained villain, — the impersonation of relentless, diabolical malice. If Shakspeare were, as his admirers claim, one of the heaven-inspired prophets of mankind, this circumstance may suggest some interesting inferences and analogies.

From the cradle to the grave of man, woman exercises an all-pervading and unintermitted influence upon his character and destiny. She calls forth and directs his earliest emotions. All that is good in him, all that is true, all that is immortal, — and nothing is immortal but goodness and truth, — is owing to her watchful and tireless nurture of his instincts. In the helplessness of infancy, woman is to him as Providence, awakening in him those feelings, which, afterwards, rise and expand to philanthropy and devotion. She is his earliest conception of God. Through the whole of his mortal existence, a mother's love is to him a bright and visible symbol of divine love; pure, unselfish, self-sacrificing, unchanging, unquenchable, it goes out with him in all the alternations of life, in sorrow and in joy, in sickness and health, rejoicing and sorrowing with him and for him, and for him alone, clinging to him with a closer grasp, when all have deserted him, and because all have deserted him, and even in disgrace and infamy not forsaking him: — love stronger than pain, than death, and the grave.

The dreams of the youth-man are of paradise, a garden heaven-environed, fanned by wings of angels, in which ever bloom flowers of celestial fragrance, in whose walks he hears the soft voices of unseen spirits. Yet the garden is without beauty, the voices utter no music, unless there be an Eve to listen with him, to wander with him among the groves of the garden, and repose with him in its bowers.

In this period of the poetry of his existence, woman, either for good or evil, is nearly all in all, the cynosure

of his thoughts and feelings. When he descends into the prose regions of the business and matter-of-fact of life, he still finds himself under a moral necessity of taking woman as his companion and aid. He finds the walks of business empty, the crowded mart a desert, unless around their precincts hover visions of beloved forms at home, which light up the desert and the solitude with smiles. In every period of his life it has been true, that

“The world was sad, the garden was a wild,
And man, the hermit, sighed, till woman smiled.”

Undoubtedly the dreams of the youth, and the calculations of the man, are often destined to woful and disastrous disappointment. The poetry, when committed to paper, too often comes out without rhyme or reason, intolerable blank verse, or miserable, halting doggerel. The prose, too, is unreadable, full of uncouth idioms, and false syntax. Eve, after all, often proves herself a mere mortal, and that not of the highest cast. The angel is sometimes a spirit of another sort than one of light. The companion is occasionally one, with whom a quiet man would be loth to associate forever — a very vixen and termagant. But still, in every circumstance, woman affects, with heavenly or unheavenly influences, the condition and character of man through the whole of life.

It is a truth, universally assumed and admitted, that there is no test of the advancement of civilization so sure and infallible, as that afforded by the position of woman in society, the rank assigned to her in the scale of social adjustment. It is a just and true test; for civilization, in its ultimate analysis, is the overthrow of the law of force. Wherever the law of force, the right of the strongest, prevails, woman must be, by the physical laws of nature, inferior and degraded. As this law recedes, woman will be exalted, and the degree of her elevation will be the index of the degree in which the law of force has yielded to the law of

right. The influence of woman is a purely moral influence. Her physical constitution and intellectual temperament debar her from any other. Her place in society may, therefore, be taken as a fair indication of the relative predominance of right and force.

Again, it is claimed as one of the noblest achievements of Christianity, that it has done so much for woman, to exalt her character and elevate her social condition. This is but another form of stating the principle, that her social condition is the test of civilization. For the influence of Christianity is a moral power, and its progress is a contest with the law of force. As Christianity prevails, therefore, force is beaten down, and the law of justice is exalted.

To apply this test. In savage nations, the right of the strongest is the only law. There woman, the weak, is a mere drudge, on whom are imposed all the servile and laborious occupations; while man, the strong, deems all labor degrading, but war and hunting—labors of force, destruction. In barbarous and half-civilized nations, man has so far learned to pity the weakness of woman, as not to impose upon her the most laborious out-of-door employments. But he has not yet learned that she has a soul. His instincts for beauty have been somewhat developed, and he pays her homage as an impersonation of beauty. But his highest feelings towards her are sensual, and in his deepest condescension, she is but the plaything of his idle hours, a graceful ornament of his harem. She has, in some degree, ceased to be the laborious drudge, without having risen to the rank of his companion.

In the progress of civilization, the condition of woman has been gradually still further meliorated. She has come to be considered as in some degree a rational being, having an intellect, that may be improved to some extent, and moral powers, which make her an accountable portion of Humanity; to whom a portion of knowledge, suitable to her proper sphere, may be permitted, and which she is at liberty, within that sphere, to communicate. The highest degree of

external deference is paid to her ; as a late writer has said, “ she has the best place in stage-coaches ; when there are not chairs enough for everybody, the gentlemen stand ; she hears oratorical flourishes, on public occasions, about wives and home, and apostrophes to woman ; and, especially, her morals are guarded by the strictest observance of propriety in her presence. In short, indulgence is given her instead of justice.” The writer might have added to the list of indulgences, that the gentlemen pay the bills at sleigh-rides and balls, and the parson’s fee at their own weddings ; though one exception to the universality of this practice is on record.

But, admirable as is the improvement in the condition of woman, it is not yet the end. Civilization is nowhere perfected. The law of force is far from being completely abolished. Woman may aspire higher than former ages permitted, but she may not aspire to the highest. Her rights are abridged ; her sphere of action and of duty is narrowed and hedged in. She is not yet the acknowledged equal of man, entitled to an equal standing on the great platform of human rights.

If great principles could be settled by analogies, it might be plausibly argued, that woman was intended to be the superior and master of man. The order of Providence, as manifested in creation, and the course of human affairs, is ever from the imperfect towards the perfect. From the time when the spirit of God first moved upon the face of the waters, successive orders of being, beginning with the lowest, arose in ascending series, each of a higher organization than the preceding, until the series was closed by the breathing of the divine spirit into man. Such has ever been, with partial interruptions and retrogressions, the progressive improvement of man in society ; ever, as then, from the lower to the higher, from the less to the more perfect. Adam was created before Eve. Adam was created out of the dust of the ground. The sordid earth was purified and refined, and made fit for the

residence of the celestial spirit. Eve was created from these refined and purified elements, with a more delicate and spiritual organization. Still the order was from the imperfect to the more perfect. I will not pursue, nor insist upon this analogy. I only claim for woman the communion of the great brotherhood in unity of Humanity — equality with man, the same natural rights, and, as a consequence, the same social and political rights and duties.

“ So God created man ; in the likeness of God made he him ; male and female created he *them*, and he called *their* name Adam.”

But, says the objector, “ What a shocking sight it would be to see women meddling with politics, and writing electioneering articles for the newspapers ! How would it look to see a woman spouting at caucuses and town-meetings, sitting, debating, perhaps presiding in Congress, mingling with men, and voting upon political questions, upon tariffs, banks, and currency ? ”

Such, if I mistake not, is the spirit of the argument against the political rights of woman ; not a reference to universal principles, but to appearances, fashion, conventional proprieties. Let us not be duped by words. Ridicule is no test of truth, and it is very easy for one, who has no veneration for truth, to place the highest in a ludicrous aspect. To the question, then, how it would look to see woman restored to her true position of moral, intellectual, and social equality with man ; I reply that, with the present opinions of society, it would look, to the great majority of men, and perhaps of women themselves, very much as that time appeared to the feudal aristocracies, or to those of mis-called republican Greece and Rome, when the commons, having caught a glimpse of the everlasting principle, that God created man everywhere the equal of man, asserted their right to participate in public deliberations, by which their interests were to be affected. Precisely as the cotemporary aristocracies of our revolution regarded the unheard-of phenomenon

of a whole nation simultaneously disowning the divine right of kings, and asserting the divine right of the people. Precisely as the noble few have always regarded the encroachment of the masses upon their hereditary privileges, will this innovation, the acknowledgment of the political rights of woman, be viewed by all, who think the aristocracy of sex constitutes the perfection of social order, while all other artificial aristocracies are palpable violations of natural, essential rights.

All the social and civil rights, which the masses of men anywhere enjoy, have been achieved by contest, by revolution more or less sudden and complete; by the breaking down of the prejudices of ages, and the overthrow of principles, which were believed to be the everlasting ordinances of Heaven, and whose subversion was regarded as a forewarning of anarchy, desolation, and ruin. So now is regarded the assertion for woman of political rights and duties; of her capacity to think or talk aught but scandal and frivolity; about anything but "custards and cream-toast." The idea of a female politician is a very bugbear; a word conveying all that can be expressed of unutterable scorn. The readers of literary history, and especially of the fashionable novels of the last generation, have heard of a personage called a "*Blue Stocking*," — a word both of contempt and fear, or perhaps expressive of the emotions that might be supposed to be excited by an educated tiger; or, if the tiger were too terrible an emblem, of a learned grimaldin, who could talk and write, but had not cut her claws. The *Blue Stocking* was a literary woman, — one who had dared to step beyond the bounds prescribed by lordly man, to wander into the forbidden fields, and gather for herself some of the flowers of truth and beauty, which were blooming in the garden of Humanity. She had felt the instinct of higher powers and a nobler destiny than the false customs of society had assigned to her. She felt the capacity, and panted for a higher knowledge than could be

attained, or was permitted within the narrow limits of her compelled social condition. Undoubtedly she was somewhat of a pedant, and made a disagreeable display of her intellectual riches. But her ostentation of learning was natural, and therefore excusable. "Where intellect has a fair chance, there is no pedantry among men or women, [except very young ones.] It is the result of an intellect, which cannot be wholly passive, but must demonstrate some force, and does so through the medium of narrow morals. Pedantry indicates the first struggles of intellect with its restraints, and is, therefore, a hopeful symptom."* Under the law of force, to which she was subjected, she paid the penalty of contumely and scorn, which her brother man had paid for his attempts to throw off the crushing burden, which the same law had imposed upon his neck. But this reproach is now, in some measure, wiped away, and woman's right of knowledge partially admitted. Since De Staël, More, Edgeworth, our own Sedgwick, Sigourney, and Child, have written, the epithet of blue-stocking has ceased to be a term of absolute scorn. The possibility, and even the necessity, of educating the mothers and wives of a people intending to be democratic, is admitted and even insisted on. Women are allowed, to a certain extent, to aid in the work of public education, and to contribute something to the stock of national literature. They may write and publish poetry, novels, and moral essays, compile catechisms of natural science, and the censorship of their closet studies is very considerably relaxed. But they may not, in word or deed, intrude into the field of politics, which man reserves as his exclusive domain. The fear of the Blue Stocking has been transferred to the Female Politician. This may be illustrated by the comparative estimation in which female authors, who confine themselves to polite literature, and Harriet Martineau, superior to most of them, are held.

* Miss Martineau.

The idea, that there are some natural rights, with which woman has no concern, that she is out of her proper sphere when she busies herself with certain parts of the machinery of society, is founded upon two or three fallacies, or misapprehensions of moral relations. The first is a mistake, or want of a full and just understanding of the great truth—a truth equally true in its application to morals and politics—of human brotherhood, the doctrine of the universal equality of man with man. What is this equality? What rights does it imply? Whom does it include? It certainly does not mean that all men are created equal in respect to physical organization, intellectual capacity, the environment of circumstances, or the accidents of fortune. In none of these respects, certainly not in all, is one man the equal of every other man. It can mean only equality in the sight of God, equality of rights, duties, moral responsibilities, to life, liberty, and happiness, and of equal protection from society in the enjoyment of those rights. They are natural rights, because they are conferred by God; conferred because man was created to be a free agent, and these endowments are necessary in order to the full exercise of that freedom, and the discharge of the accountableness it involves. These rights are not within the control of society, nor dependent upon the will of governments. Government may not withhold or restrain them, even with the consent of the individual; for they are in their nature as inalienable as accountableness, and must be retained from necessity, if not of choice. Their obligations are still upon every subject of the divine government, even though, in his mad impiety, he should propose to relinquish them. These natural rights are the consequences and conditions of free agency, and belong to every one, who is accountable to God. Is woman less a subject of moral responsibility than man? Until this is proved, society is guilty of open injustice and oppression, while it withholds from woman any right which it secures to man. The fundamental idea of a demo-

cratic government is that of a compact for the security of every individual in the enjoyment of his natural rights. It again follows from this that every one has an equal interest in this protection, and of course a right to an equal participation in the arrangements of government.

This doctrine of equality and natural rights is generally admitted as true; but it is practically interpreted, so as to except from its meaning and operation two large classes of human beings, both together comprising more than half of the population of these United States, whose constitution is professedly based upon, and intended to carry out that doctrine:—I mean women and negroes. This is another fallacy, which deserves to be exposed, and has been in part anticipated. Because women are not men, they can have no social rights, but such as are graciously conceded to them as a favor. If not upon this technical subtlety, I know not upon what ground the female portion of the community is shut out from the participation of rights, which are guarantied to the other part. This is the law of force. It has been shown that the rule of equality is founded on responsibility. Its application is not limited to man, as the nobler division of the human species, but embraces every human being. The natural rights belong to every one, as an incident of Humanity, by virtue of human nature, and not of sex. To deny them to woman, is to deny that truth is eternal and universal.

Another fallacy, by which the false and degraded position of woman is attempted to be justified, is the erroneous notions prevailing concerning the true objects and scope of government. In all countries, which are not simple despotisms, where the people have been recognised as having some rights independent of the will of the monarch, the grand problem is to contrive a plan for the easiest government of the people. The government is something distinct from the people, an antagonist power. All governments have been founded in force, originating in the power

of the strongest, and maintained, through all their departments and operations, by the law of force. All improvements, favorable to the masses, have been the results of fierce contests between right and power — the rights of man, and the power of government. In these contests, man has seldom placed himself upon the ground of his native prerogatives; but rather craved his rights, not as if they were rights, but as favors, and been content to hold them as grants from the sovereign. Such is the tenure by which the people of every nation in Europe hold whatever of liberty they enjoy. They appeal, in their defence, not to the eternal laws of justice and equality, but to Magna Charta and brave Barons of Runnymede. Individual rights are held as gifts, and the avowed aim of such governments is to control the people with the least amount of concession that will keep them quiet. In these governments of force, it is vain to expect that the feeblest class, unfitted alike by physical constitution and moral temperament for the struggles of brute force, should be allowed to possess her natural equality.

In our country, the law of force is professedly abolished, and the law of natural right, in theory, established. Yet, in regard to the practical maxims of government, and the notions concerning the relations of the State and the people, there is not so great a difference as ought to be expected, between the new and the old world. To a very great extent, at least practically, it is customary to regard our constitutions and bills of right, “not as attempts to enumerate the natural rights of man, and define the natural powers of governments, but as compacts between the people as individuals, and the people as a State; or, more properly, as declarations of what the people in convention assembled have willed to be the rights of individuals, and have ordained to be the powers of government.” *

Whatever form may be given to this statement, it

* Boston Quarterly Review, No. I.

amounts at last to this, that we hold our liberties as grants, and not as rights ; as favors from the government or the people in convention assembled, and which the same power may, of course, revoke at pleasure. Perhaps none would have reason to complain of this, who were parties to the convention, or assented to its decisions. To those who have done neither, the government or the convention is oppressive, and an usurper. The framers of our constitutions seem to have had but an imperfect view of the grasp and comprehensiveness of the principle, which they announced as their foundation. It were not to be expected, perhaps, that they would go forth at once, through the whole length and breadth of the principle, and communicate its benefits to all whom it legitimately embraced. They probably had no conception of political rights, as an attribute of women, except of those rarely fortunate few, in whom a few drops of the divine blood of kings happened to flow.

Another theory is, that our rights, or rather the laws which regulate and modify them, are dependent upon the will of the majority ; that our government is a government of the majority. This is called the democratic principle, and is just, when limited to matters of mere social policy or expediency. But the theory is false, and the government is, after all, the government of the minority ; for at least one half of those, who are affected by the acts of the government, have no voice in its direction. But I deny the authority of majorities to control, or abridge, natural rights. Wherever there is a power above the laws of natural right, whether it be a single will or a majority, there is absolutism.

In any view of the matter, woman has been throughout treated with injustice. She has been directly a party to no constitutions of government, though all have compromised and denied her rights. Over her, then, government has no legitimate authority, for "the only just foundation of government is the consent of

the governed." To those, therefore, who have not consented to it, government is a usurpation.

The great fallacy of every theory of government is, that man, the individual, is regarded as nothing, or at most as only a fraction of the population of the State. Rights, proclaimed as natural and inalienable, become, under the operation of social institutions, the creatures of social expediency, subject to abridgment and restriction by the power of majorities. • Man, as man, is merged in man the citizen. But the highest legitimate function of government is to protect man in his individuality. This truth is not yet acknowledged; but it will be, and it will regenerate man and society, as just and clear views prevail of the true spirit of democracy, of the destiny of man, and the mission of government.

Woman is peculiarly concerned in the right understanding of the foundation and powers of government. For ages she has suffered under a double wrong. As a subject of the State, deprived of some of the most important natural rights, condemned to a state of hopeless political degradation, and, as a consequence, debarred by public opinion from the exercise of her moral and intellectual powers in some of their highest and noblest manifestations. It becomes her, then, as one of the equal fraternity of mankind, to demand by what authority she is thus "cribbed, cabined, and confined;" whence government or opinion derived the power to circumscribe the range of her mind, or to say to her free thought, "thus far shalt thou come, and no farther," to come between Heaven and her own soul, and decide, authoritatively, what are her rights and what her duties? In this view, woman has much—she has more than any other portion of mankind—to do with politics. Her physical weakness requires that she should be interested, and admitted to an equal agency in them, to exercise influence, wherever influence may be exercised by any; so that the law of force, which has hitherto been the foundation of the relations of governments with man,

may be beaten down, and a new edifice of government be built up on the true corner stone of natural, unalterable, and equal right. That time will come. The prophets of all ages have foreseen and predicted it; and seers now behold its beaming indications in the present. To accelerate it, man and woman must co-operate side by side on the ground of equal rights; not as gentlemen and ladies,—those poor terms, which keep Humanity out of sight,—but in the common attributes of human nature, as men and women.

The claim of woman to political right is far from being limited to the case of the pure democracy above shadowed forth. Under any system of government she cannot be justly excluded; because she is a subject of government, from whom duties are claimed, and the duty involves the reciprocal right.

But consider the indecorum of the thing,—delicate, modest, retiring woman, all whose virtues should be household, whose proper sphere is the nursery, the laundry, the kitchen, whose gentle influence should shed the sunshine of heaven only around the domestic fireside,—think of her leaving her babes unfed and squalling, her washtubs on the floor unemptied, her ironing undone, or, perchance, the sirloin roasted to a cinder, while she rushes to the hustings to engage in the turmoil of political strife.

I remark, in the first place, that the decorum is one thing, and the right another. The right is inalienable; the manner and spirit of its exercise is an affair between the individual and conscience. For any present accountability, if she neglect her domestic duties in the exercise of her political rights, she must settle it with her husband, if she have one, or if not, the fixed and steady laws of Providence will bring the inevitable penalty of suffering for every violation or neglect of duty. Government has nothing to do with it. But why this fear? The exercise of political rights forms but a very small item of the business, and occupies an inconsiderable portion of the time, of those who possess them. Men, of whom politics are claimed as the

appropriate vocation, are not very much in the habit of neglecting their private affairs, deserting their farms, workshops, or merchandise, to their detriment, because they have political interests and rights. I am not aware, that many men, who possess the elective franchise, are at all more apt than those who have it not, to neglect their business, because they are occasionally called upon to vote, or discuss a question of public policy. What reason is there to fear, that women, with political rights, should fail in any domestic duty, when the domestic relations are confessedly, by nature and temperament, their peculiar and appropriate sphere of duty? It seems to be a strange involution of argument, to allege as a reason for excluding them from their rights, the very circumstance which gives assurance that they will use them with propriety and moderation.

But shall she be engaged in political strife? Certainly not. Neither should man. Strife is ungraceful in man or woman, an abuse of liberty, a contempt of man, and of man's rights. It is because strife is the characteristic, and believed to be a necessary incident of political discussion, that I would bring over it the tempering and conciliating influence of woman's presence. Politics, to the reproach and disgrace of democratic liberty, is among us the fierce conflict of opposing passions, in the highest hardly better than a combat of gladiators. Politicians are mere partisans, and man, as man, has lost himself in the political prize-fighter. Discussion is little more than crimination and recrimination, detraction, and impeachment of opponents. The offices of the State are but golden prizes, fought for with selfish ardor, to be distributed among the successful combatants. Into such an arena it may seem to evince but little of the spirit of chivalry to desire the presence of woman. Yet it is because it is thus foul and dark, that she should be invoked to enter as a purifying spirit. I need not dwell upon the softening and civilizing influences of female society. It is the theme of the philosopher as

well as the poet and lover. Mark the difference in the temper of the social and political intercourse of partisans. This is justly to be attributed to the presence and more direct influence of woman. Let her be allowed to act wherever man acts ; let woman, with her gentleness, go wherever man, with his passions, goes, and will not the same results follow ? Will not the savage be tamed in the forum, as he has been in the saloon ? The effect is certain, for it is founded upon the original principles of human nature. Deference for woman is an instinct of man, never wholly eradicated even in the most degraded. This is not more a tribute to her feebleness, than a reverence for Humanity in its purest manifestations. The paradise dreams of the youth are not always false. They are so often false, because woman is not what she should be, because society has not permitted her intellect to develop itself. They will come true, when woman becomes what she should be, what she was created to be, what she one day will be. I claim, then, for woman, political rights, and would have her a politician, because I would rescue politics from the exclusive possession of knaves and jockeys ; because I would have politics rescued from their degradation, and elevated to the rank of a moral science, the science of social progress ; because I would not have political discussion a theatre for the exhibition of fierce and malignant passions and party interests ; but the calm investigation of right by men conscious of individual independence as the birthright of all, and each respecting that right in every other ; and because I would have it understood, that the proper function of government is not the making of arbitrary laws, but the discovery and publication of the laws of nature ; and, chief of all, to secure to every individual the most perfect exercise of his free agency.

But the right of woman to political equality rests on other grounds. It may be demanded under acknowledged principles of politics as they are. I have referred to one of the principles of natural justice

asserted in our constitutions, that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. All our governments claim the same power over woman as over the rest of the community. Women have not consented, they have not been required, nor permitted to consent to these governments. So far, then, as it exercises power over woman, government is to her usurpation, is tyranny, is the government of force. Excepting the bearing of arms and the capitation tax, I know of no power exercised by government to which woman is not subjected equally with man. As to woman, these laws are not just, because they are not derived from their consent.

Again, it is a fundamental maxim that taxation and representation are reciprocal; in other words, the right of property being a natural right, property cannot justly be taken from any individual without his consent, directly given, or according to constitutional forms, to which he has given his consent. For the violation of this principle of natural justice, these United States abjured allegiance to Great Britain, and through contest, suffering, and blood, achieved national independence. This principle is violated with respect to women, and, therefore, government is to them a system of injustice and force.

The general apology for the exclusion of women is, that, as their interests are involved with those of men; their husbands or fathers, that no injustice is done; that they virtually enjoy and exercise political rights through their husbands and fathers.

If a connexion of interests between two or more individuals were a just cause for withholding a natural right from one of them, a very considerable portion of the people must be disfranchised; for there is hardly an individual in society, whose interests are entirely separated from those of every other. Besides, the rule proves too much; for it embraces every natural right in every case, where an involution of interest exists. To give any plausibility to the argument, the interests must be identical. But identity of interests,

except in a few particulars,—and even then it is doubtful,—cannot, from the very constitution of the mind, and the nature of personal responsibility, exist between any two human beings. There is no such thing as a universal oneness of interests, such as is required by the argument, any more than there is an identity of thought or feelings. It can never approach a greater nearness than sympathy, or communion in some particulars. That such a sympathy or communion should work the disfranchisement of any part of those who are bound together by it, is too obviously absurd to deserve a moment's notice.

At any rate, what right has government to declare that the interests of one person are involved, or identical with those of another, in such a manner as to make the political rights of one the political rights of the other? If anything is most clearly a matter of private judgment, this is one. The laws practically deny the notion of identity in this case, for they have provided for the protection of women against their husbands and fathers. The history of domestic life is too often the history of wrong, of vexing petulance or fierce strife, alienated affections, warring passions, mutual reproach and crimination, to admit the idea that either party, and especially the weaker, has merged and abandoned all its rights. But, unfortunately,—and, with the present opinions of society, it is a social misfortune for a woman not to have a husband, though the veriest fool or tyrant,—many women have neither husbands nor fathers, nor any other connexion, with whom their interests may be supposed to be involved. By what rule are these disfranchised? By their sex—by the law of force.

The abstract truth of most of the principles I have stated will be generally admitted; they are declared to be self-evident by the fundamental constitution of our government, and they have a higher sanction in the instinctive perceptions of the mind. Still, there is a lurking skepticism concerning them, a deep-seated unbelief that they are anything but abstractions, splen-

did and imposing indeed, but unfitted for existing states of society,—or, as the Roanoke orator denominated them, “*fanfaronades*.” They are truths, but not practical ones; truths to be controlled by supposed necessities of social expediency. Hence, woman is denied her natural rights, because it is assumed that the duties they involve are out of her proper sphere; that political duties are incompatible with other duties of paramount obligation. Who has made man a judge of woman’s duties? Who has given him authority to decide that one is incompatible with another; or, being so, to take away from her the liberty of determining for herself which she will perform, and which leave undone? It would be difficult to show that political duties are less incompatible with the other duties of artisans and laborers, than with those of woman. Yet governments have taken no precautions to prevent, or reconcile the collision of the duties of the artisan or laborer; but left the whole matter where nature placed it, to be regulated by the individual judgment and discretion. But, in the case of woman, the great truth seems to be overlooked, that God has given to every one time and power for the discharge of every duty, and that it is an assumption of the prerogatives of Heaven for government to prescribe its limits, or dictate the mode of performing it.

Still the objection recurs, these things are out of woman’s proper sphere. I ask again, what man, or body of men in convention assembled, have a right to decide, dictatorially, what is the proper sphere of any other human being; to prescribe to whole classes a peculiar orbit, and forbid any individual of the class to wander out of it? It is the doctrine of all aristocracies; the offspring of the law of force. We see many a legislator, who would be more usefully employed in pegging shoes; many a judge, who would fulfil his social duties more worthily by making hobnails; many a lawyer, acquainted with nothing but the quibbles and technicalities, and utterly without

conception of the true majesty and grandeur of law ; many physicians, mere quacks ; many divines, unintelligible expounders of unintelligible dogmas, and apparently ignorant of the first elements of the relations of man with his Creator. On the other hand, have we not seen many a mender of old soles, to whom, — as to George Fox, a shoemaker and the first of the Quakers, — to whom, in the words of one of his admirers, though not of his sect, “ the divine idea of the universe is pleased to manifest itself, and who are, therefore, rightfully accounted prophets ; God-possessed.” * In the mind of many a hammerer of iron lie hidden, as in that of the blacksmith of Scotland, the elements of railroads and locomotives. And many a ploughman-poet has wasted his sweetness on the desert air. All these were clearly out of their proper spheres. Why, then, did not society interfere, to adjust the eccentricity, and restore each individual to his proper orbit ? Why, but because it was seen, with respect to man, that he and no other has a right to select his own sphere, to choose for himself good and evil, and abide the consequences of his choice.

But, the proper sphere of woman ! The savage decides that her proper sphere is to be his servant and drudge. The Mahometan ordains that her proper sphere is the harem. The southern planter holds that both these are her proper sphere. So the feudal lords decided that the proper sphere of the masses of mankind was serfdom and vassalage to themselves. The crowned heads of the earth fix the proper sphere of the rest of the world in subjection, in passive obedience and non-resistance ; and Nicholas has added the worship of the Autocrat as a portion of the proper sphere. But man has found out that none of these is his proper sphere. He has caught glimpses of the true and high sphere assigned him by God, and is soaring upward towards it. Some of the nations are almost in sight of the Empyrean ; others are following

* Sartor Resartus.

in long progression ; while some have not yet discovered that "man has wings." But they will all find it out, and all will rise to the true sphere at last. And woman's turn will come, and not, perhaps, the last ; but all the sooner, when she arrives at the true and broad conception of her sphere ; the sphere, in the words of one of the noblest and truest of her sex, "appointed by God, and bounded by the powers which he has bestowed."

The proper sphere of woman is home. So repeats the asserter of her social and political inferiority ; and so admits the advocate of her equality. The proper sphere of woman is home. And so it is, by necessity as well as choice, the immediate and proper sphere of all human action, of man as well as woman. Man's highest interests, his dearest affections, wishes, fears, and hopes, cluster round and are concentrated in home. His labors, thoughts, actions, are all employed in that sphere of which home is the heaven-illumined centre. But it is the exclusive sphere of neither man nor woman. What is home, but the school appointed by Providence, in which man trains himself and is trained, as husband, wife, parent, and child, for the duties of man. It embraces every field of action, where man has duties. Both are joint partakers of its labors and responsibilities. Nature has pointed out the proper distribution of manual toil, by the difference of bodily constitution, and has indicated no other difference in rights and duties, unless it be that she has assigned a higher portion of the intellectual labor to woman. Home is the noblest, as the most appropriate sphere of duty, when it is regarded as the threshold of man's destiny, from which the soul looks forth as the entrance to the boundless field of human interests and activity. But if it be regarded as the only proper sphere, the beginning and the end of duty, home will be like any other prison ; the intellect is narrowed down to petty cares ; the tone of morals lowered and debased ; man sinks into the mere farmer, artisan, or shopkeeper ; and woman into the housekeeper. This,

I apprehend, is what is generally understood by the sphere proper ; not home in its high moral attributes and manifestations ; but the house, the household and its cares. Hence carefulness and economy, to be a good seamstress, laundress, cook, or dairy-woman, comprise the sum of woman's duty ; marriage becomes, of course, the chief end of her existence, and mental improvement a very subordinate concern.

Let me not be thought to speak contemptuously of these household accomplishments. A tidy house, a clean shirt, and a good dinner, are requisites too indispensable in the science of comfort, to allow us to despise the skill to which we are indebted for them. But they are not the chief end of life, nor incompatible with the development of the higher faculties. On the contrary, man, in acquiring an intellectual companion, a sharer with him in the equal prerogatives of Humanity, would at the same time secure a more faithful and economical superintendent of his household. So thinks one, who unites great intellectual endowments with the highest moral graces. "That man must indeed be narrow-minded, and can have but a poor conception of the power of moral truth on the female heart, who supposes that a correct view of her own rights can make woman less solicitous to fill up every department of duty."* So thinks another, who is said to be herself no less skilful in moving and satisfying the appetite, than she is known to be in moving and filling the heart. "Other things being equal, a woman of the highest mental endowments will always be the best housekeeper ; for domestic economy is a science, that brings into action the qualities of the mind, as well as the graces of the heart. A quick perception, judgment, discrimination, decision, and order, are high attributes of mind [and the chief requisites for public usefulness], and are all in daily exercise in the well ordering of a family. If a sensible woman, an intellectual woman, a woman of genius,

* Miss S. M. Grimké.

is not a good housewife, it is not because she is either, or all of them, but because there is some deficiency in her character, or some omission of duty, that should make her very humble, instead of her indulging in any secret self-complacency, on account of a certain superiority, which only aggravates her fault.”*

That home is not the proper boundary of woman's sphere of duty, appears in her susceptibility to excitement in any enterprise, which carries her sympathies abroad into the world, her readiness and zeal to engage in benevolent associations for communicating religious knowledge to other lands, and the rescue of the oppressed everywhere. However we may lament the often waste and misdirection of this zeal, we must admire its purity and devotedness. I reverence it as a development of the instincts of Humanity.

But a woman making speeches in public, in a promiscuous assembly, men and women mixed together, how indelicate, and inconsistent with the retiring modesty which is the peculiar grace of woman!

To this it may be replied, that it does not follow, that, because women are admitted to political rights, there must be promiscuous assemblies. There would be no great inconvenience in separate places of voting, or separate houses of legislature, as there are at present. A female branch of the legislature would be more democratic, more accordant with the indications of nature, than the present unmeaning, aristocratic constitution of our State Legislatures. But what is there so shocking in promiscuous assemblies? What so repugnant to existing usages and habits of society, that the very fear of them should exclude women from their rights? Promiscuous assemblies of both sexes are daily and nightly holden, without any suspicion of indecorum, for purposes of devotion, improvement, and mere amusement. Nay, it is not generally thought that woman occupies a position, which ought to call a blush into the cheek of retiring modesty, when she

* Miss Sedgwick.

exhibits her person in all the variety of graceful attitude called forth in the exercise of dancing, and even revels on the "light, fantastic toe" from the vesper to the matin bell. Is it more a sin against delicacy in woman, to discuss in public political questions, involving high moral interests, or to pour out, before a mixed assembly, the fulness of a generous heart swelling with a deep feeling of the wrongs of Humanity? Or are the actions of woman appropriate and innocent, only when they gratify the senses, and feed the sentiment of the beautiful; and guilty only when they exhibit moral and intellectual power, a capacity for, and conception of, the great, the good, the true? A great truth pressing upon the mind is inspiration, and whoso feels it is bound to give it utterance. That cannot be wrong in woman, which in man is the voice of Heaven. And shall we, for the sake of the decorous, the mere seemings of society, violate one principle of everlasting right? "That woman has power to represent her own interests, no one can deny till she has been tried. The modes must vary with circumstances. The principle being once established, the methods will follow naturally, easily, and with a remarkable transmutation of the ludicrous to the sublime. The kings of Europe would have laughed mightily, two centuries ago, at the idea of a commoner, without robes, crown, or sceptre, stepping into the throne of a strong nation. Yet who dared to laugh, when Washington's super-royal voice greeted the New World from the Presidential chair, and the Old World stood still to catch the echo?"*

If this reasoning should satisfy any one of the correctness of the general principle, it may be said, that woman is not prepared for this emancipation, that she must be educated for politics before she can be entrusted with political rights. If this objection be anything more than a man of straw set up by myself, it affords another instance of the injustice which woman is

* Miss Martineau.

suffering from the false maxims of social morality. The fathers of our revolution made no such inquiries, and imposed no such conditions of freedom upon man. It was sufficient that a man was a man—with only a trifling implied exception as to color—to entitle him to all the natural and political rights. Concerning man, no such inquiries or conditions are made now. Every one, who wears, or may wear a beard,—except he be under temporary sequestration for the public good,—is admitted to the full communion of citizenship, without inquiry as to his fitness to use it worthily. The ignorant with the wise; the knave with the honest; the extortioner with the benevolent and just; the drunkard with the abstinent; the contemner of the people with him who reverences the divine principle in Humanity in its rudest forms; the hireling dealer in the flesh of his brother with him who abhors manstealing; the defiers of the law, the mobbers and lynchers and high-bred incendiaries, and gentlemanly ruffians, with the lovers of order and upholders of the law,—all are equally secured in the enjoyment of their social franchises; and when the sequestration, of which I have spoken, is ended, the felon walks forth with unimpaired rights, a free man, and, with inconsiderable exceptions, the legal equal of every other.

Social institutions and the prejudices of ages have done all they could to unfit woman for the performance of the highest social duties. But I am weary of that false philosophy and unbelieving morality, which fears to leave man alone with his responsibilities. Social injustice has debased and degraded whole classes of Humanity, and makes the debasement, itself has created, the apology for continuing the wrong. It is hardly better than practical atheism, this doubting of Providence, this belief that the principles of justice are not eternal and immutable, this assertion of the necessity of continuing to do evil, in the hope of some possible good that may ultimately come. 'The enlightened instincts of man are sufficient for man's guidance, if he be left in the liberty wherewith God has made

him free. Civil institutions, social laws, interfere with his liberty, lead him away from the sure foundations of his spontaneous reason, the voice of God in his mind, and place him under another, a low and arbitrary standard of right and duty, dependent on the wills of men, and varying with the changes of political majorities. Natural rights are man's absolutely, and without qualification, nor dependent on the assent of communities or society. Society cannot withhold them without injustice to man, and irreverence to Heaven. Society is never in danger from doing justice without conditions. Justice, while God rules, will ever be found to be the truest policy, the wisest expediency. Justice is the elementary principle of democracy. Let that prevail in spirit and in truth, there would be no complaint of rights violated or withheld, no fear to do justice and leave consequences, in hopeful confidence, to the God of right. I do not mean what is popularly miscalled democracy, the democracy of majorities, nor of parties — of Jefferson or Van Buren. I mean the democracy of which Jesus was the preacher and prophet; which is the political manifestation of his religion; which teaches the regenerating doctrine of human brotherhood, that man is the equal of man everywhere; not man in sexes, man as men and women, man as a citizen, or subject of civil government; but man in his immortal character, as a child-God; man as he is to be in that improved state, where "they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God."

Neither men nor women are yet fitted for the just exercise of this freedom. Few even understand it. This nation has done much practically to deny and nullify the great truths it was the first to discover and proclaim, by withholding from more than one half of the mass of Humanity in the United States, the rights which it announced as the birthright of all. May we not discover in some of the developments of our social condition, the inflexible retributions of justice for our social wrongs? While the intellect of woman is tied

down and confined in a narrow circle ; while she is debarred from the pursuit of those objects for which an enlarged education is requisite ; while she is exposed to scorn, if her intellectual activity exceeds what is necessary to fit her for the sphere proper, which custom has prescribed to her ; and her highest duties terminate in those of a prudent housekeeper and careful nurse ; she cannot rise, in the mass, to the true dignity of woman's nature. She almost of necessity is made narrow in her aims, and trifling in her pursuits. I am aware that there are many exceptions to this general lot. I do not forget that many women have acquired a high and deserved, and some a permanent, intellectual reputation. Yet their labors have been accepted, because they have been exerted within the proper sphere, or in orbits not very eccentric from it, — in the lighter departments of literature, and some branches of social and universal morals. I know, too, what a penalty some of the noblest and bravest of their sex are now paying, for their temerity in wandering out of their proper sphere into that which man has claimed as his exclusively.

Has woman sunk alone ? Has man wrought out effects adequate to his high prerogatives ? The cords, that bind man to woman, strong, though invisible, cannot be broken. His destiny is indissolubly linked with hers, and, for good or for evil, her influence overshadows him everywhere. Man alone is not man ; he is but the divided half of Humanity, and she by nature the nobler and the purer. Each is necessary to the other, that the duties of the whole man, of man the unit, may be fitly performed, and his destiny fully accomplished. Wherever she goes, he must follow, and he cannot go, with his full moral power, where she may not accompany him. His instincts tell him that his proper sphere is where woman's is, and he cannot entertain an enlarged and generous interest in aught that concerns not her. Is it, in any degree, a consequence of the false and unjust social position of woman, that man, both as an individual and as a

citizen, has come so far below his own true position ? That the views of men and of freemen are so narrowed down to the limits of each one's petty occupation ; that the highest conception of human duty and individual power is fulfilled if he is a good farmer, an industrious mechanic, a faithful physician, pays his taxes, votes at elections when it is perfectly convenient, and sends his children to school, as if all man's duties begin and end in his farm, and his merchandise ; that so little interest is felt in education beyond what is necessary for the handicrafts and traffic of society ; that there is so much of frivolity and worse than frivolity in the separate intercourse of men ; that man is so indifferent to politics, so ignorant of their true nature ; that his views of the extent and dignity of natural rights are so narrow, and that he has so inadequate a conception of constitutional liberty ; that when he is aroused from his apathy, he becomes a political partisan, the follower of a leader, the slave of a faction, and hence political discussion a fierce warfare, instead of a calm investigation of moral truth ; that the resolutions of caucuses and conventions are the measure of his social obligations ; that he is so indifferent to the violation of others' rights, so long as his own are untouched ; that there is so much acquiescence in the law of force, as it is exhibited in mobs, in popular reprobation of independent thought ; in the setting up of public opinion as the standard and guide of the individual judgment, in partial legislation, and legislation abridging natural rights ?

It were worse than folly to attribute all social evils, all low conceptions of right and duty, to this or any other single cause. No sane man expects, no faith, less than that which receives the impossible because it is the impossible, believes, that "the universal palingenesia of man and society" is to be effected by a single reform. But that the political degradation of woman has had an influence in degrading man, may be made clear by obvious analysis. Politically, woman is directly nothing, and man is politically and individ-

ually far less than he ought to be. Without attempting to ascertain the precise relation of one fact to the other, it may be affirmed, that, according to the degree of that relation, for the sake of elevating man, woman should be elevated. Let her be placed upon the broad platform of human rights, in all respects the equal and the helpmeet of man. Throw open to her every domain of thought, every field of activity, which man may worthily enter, not prescribing to the individual her proper sphere, but leaving it free, like man's, to be determined by the individual capacity and judgment, and the indications of environing circumstances. Reunite his dismembered and scattered segments, that so the whole restored man may go on, in the strength and power of his renovated nature, to the high destiny that awaits him in the future.

ART. V. — *Unitarianism vindicated against the charge of Skeptical Tendencies.* By JAMES WALKER. Boston: James Munroe & Co. 1839.

WE are far from proposing to review this valuable little tract, put forth by the American Unitarian Association; we have quoted its title merely as a text, — not very appropriate perhaps, — for some few remarks, which we are about to offer on Unitarianism and Trinitarianism.

Unitarianism, in the form in which it has heretofore existed in this country, as the creed of a distinct denomination, we suppose it is no offence to say, is virtually if not literally dead. Its hold on the affections of the religious community is relaxed, and its power to excite attention has pretty much passed away. It ceases to excite controversy, and we much doubt whether there can be found a single man among its professed friends, with sufficient life and courage to undertake its defence, should it be seriously attack-

ed. Scarcely a congregation in this Commonwealth takes pleasure in hearing its peculiar doctrines dwelt upon ; and it is a principle among Unitarian clergymen, rarely departed from, that its peculiarities are hardly proper subjects for pulpit exercises. No books appear in its defence or elucidation. Unitarian papers and periodicals contain little Unitarianism. The elaborate works put forth, some time since, on Biblical Criticism, by Professors Norton and Palfrey, two distinguished Unitarians, have taken no hold on the community ; and though severely attacked, have found no one to step forward in their defence. The Divinity School at Cambridge is going down. Professor Palfrey has retired from it in disgust, and taken his leave of the ministry. An old fashioned Unitarian, if appointed to succeed him, will hardly be able to sustain himself ; to appoint one of the new school, would be a virtual abandonment of Unitarianism. Mr. Norton, one of the ablest men the Unitarians in this country have ever been able to boast, and, in his way, one of the honestest, and most earnest, has publicly declared, that there is no longer a Unitarian body extant among us. We may therefore assume, that what the founders of the Unitarian denomination understood by Unitarianism, has gone the way of all the earth.

This result was inevitable. Unitarianism was mainly a negative system, a protest against certain forms of faith, which had ceased to satisfy the intellectual wants of the times. But no system of negation can long satisfy any community. Religion shrinks from negations. It affirms ; its essence is a boundless faith ; and it withers and dies when it ceases to affirm. As a positive system, Unitarianism was too meagre. Its great doctrine, the Unity of God, it asserted in common with all Trinitarians, and even with Jews and Mahometans. This doctrine is a truth, a great truth, but it is a truth, which has, in the actual state of christendom, very little direct bearing on practical life. It is not a truth, which has much power to kindle the affections, and send us forth to labor with enthusiasm

in the cause of either God or man. Unitarianism, as such, had in itself no germ of reorganization, and therefore could not serve as the nucleus of a new moral and religious world. Consequently, when its work of denial was done, it had nothing to do,—but to die.

But now Unitarianism is no more, what shall we do? Shall we throw ourselves into the arms of Trinitarians, and embrace the old symbols of faith, against which we have carried on a vigorous war for so many years? Not at all. For, we apprehend, that if the truth were told, Trinitarianism would be found to be as dead as Unitarianism. The fact is, there is at this moment no authentic religious symbol in the country; and we look for a general dissolution of the old religious world, and the creation of a new heaven and a new earth, wherein shall dwell righteousness.

God has spoken to us. His Word contains all truth; and none of us need ever hope to get beyond the truth contained in the revelation he has made. But we do not take in at once the full import of his Word. Nay, we never shall take in all its deep significance. We shall study it through eternal ages, and still be ever finding something new in it. We, however, take in what we can. What we comprehend of it at a given epoch, we embody in institutes, creeds, confessions, catechisms. These, which we call symbols of faith, at the epoch of their adoption are to us true expressions of the Word of God. At that epoch, to question them is to question the Word of God; to deny them is to deny the truth. They are the truth for that epoch, all the truth it can understand, and nothing but the truth.

But the human race is not stationary. Not individuals only advance; the race itself advances. It becomes able to take in more truth than is embodied in the old symbols, and, consequently, must reject them, and seek new and more expressive symbols.

The symbols, which reigned at first in this country, were those of the Calvinistic church, a church to which

much reverence is due. In these symbols was embodied, at the time of their adoption, the Word of God as perfectly as it was then comprehended. Much of the deep meaning of that Word was represented by the Thirty-Nine Articles, the Westminster Confession, and the Saybrook Platform. These symbols represented the views of the then advanced party of mankind. But they did not take in all truth. Several elements were left out. Some of these neglected elements were brought up by the Arminians. The Arminians had less truth, and less essential truth, than the Calvinists, but they had some elements of truth which the Calvinists had not.

The Unitarians, in this country, were the lineal descendants of the Arminians. They seized upon certain elements of truth, which the dominant churches neglected. We do not think the Unitarians had so rich a faith as the Calvinists. The truths they seized upon were fewer in number, and, in our judgment, less weighty than those of the Calvinists. Were we obliged to be either a Unitarian or a Calvinist, with our present views, we should unhesitatingly prefer to be a Calvinist. But though the Calvinistic church may be supposed to have more truth than the Unitarian, still the Unitarian has certain elements of truth, which are essential to the completeness of religious faith, and with which Humanity cannot well dispense.

What is now needed is a wise Eclecticism, by which the essential elements of all the old systems shall be selected, and, in connexion with the new elements which the progress of the race has developed, be moulded into one systematic and harmonious whole. The great work now to be done is to analyze all systems, find out what each contains that is true, disengage it from the symbolic forms in which it has hitherto been expressed, and present it to Humanity in the current language of to-day.

Our objection to the Trinitarian or Orthodox church is, that it will not permit us to undertake this analysis.

The Orthodox, as they are called, tell us that we must take their symbols as we find them, and that we must not presume to translate them, to interpret them. They would chain us down to the letter which killeth, and prevent us from embracing the truth in what are to-day spiritual and living forms. For ourselves, we could put up with their symbols, because we think we have ascertained their significance ; but we know that the mass of both Orthodox and Heterodox Christians, do not look beyond the symbol to the idea it should represent. They stick fast in the letter, and are compelled to remain without spiritual life. Now, if we were only permitted to translate these symbols, that is, to translate into what is now the vernacular tongue of Humanity the ideas, which they represent to those who comprehend them, the mass would see and embrace the truth, and be sanctified by its free and energetic workings. But this the Orthodox will neither do nor suffer to be done. The fault we charge them with is that of worshipping the symbol instead of the idea, the image instead of the reality, — which is idolatry, — and of rejecting what may be termed the liberal element. This is a serious charge, we admit ; but it is gravely made, and we fear but too easily sustained.

We cannot, then, go with the Orthodox, the Trinitarians. We prefer rather to act with the party which *was* Unitarian, but which *is* now enlarging its views and taking in not only the truth which Unitarians brought up, but which is also to be found concealed under the symbols of the Orthodox church. With them there is freedom. They acknowledge the rights of the mind, and, though some of them are a little contracted in their notions of liberty, taken as a whole they are free enough. They are the movement party in theology, and as such are commended to every believer in progress. But we love this party, not because it is Unitarian, or said to be Unitarian ; we approve it not for any of its actual dogmas, but for its liberality, because it is the LIBERAL PARTY. Its actual faith even

now is meagre enough, although it is immensely richer than it was a few years ago ; but it does allow a man to think for himself, and even to utter his thoughts, without dragging him before an ecclesiastical tribunal ; nay, without imposing any more restraint than, perhaps, is needed to make him weigh well what he is about to utter. Could we say this of our Trinitarian brethren ; would they accept the element of freedom, acknowledge the rights of the mind, and suffer us to give a free but conscientious version of their symbols into language, which men now-a-days speak and understand, we should be most happy to be of their number, for at bottom we apprehend that we embrace all their doctrines. But this is what they will not do. We cannot, then, go with them, for we go where freedom goes, and find our home only where “ the perfect law of liberty ” has its seat.

The party called Unitarian, we have said, is the movement party. It is a progressive party. Its faith to-day is much changed from what it was fifteen years ago, and we believe it is likely to change yet more. It is taking in, every day, new elements of truth. It has accepted, not indeed the democratic element in its fulness, but it has accepted that of philanthropy, as manifested by its Ministry to the Poor. This Ministry to the Poor, in its actual state, is not worth much ; but it will lead to an investigation of social wrongs and social sufferings, and finally to a thorough social reform. They are fast accepting the philosophic element, and will contribute much to the introduction and spread of a more worthy philosophy of the human mind than has ever heretofore obtained in this country. This is promised in the recent appointment of Dr. Walker Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy in Cambridge University, and in the adoption of Cousin’s Psychology as a text-book, to accompany Locke. They are evidently approaching the Orthodox. That is, they are reproducing in their own minds, under appropriate forms, the great spiritual facts, which lie under the Orthodox symbols ; and from

having been cold materialists, on the very verge of infidelity, they will, in a few years, become remarkable as evangelical Christians, and that too in the most worthy sense of the term.

Under every one of the Orthodox symbols, there lies an important truth. To most men the symbol fails, at the present time, to express this truth. The symbol hides the truth. But as soon as we have reproduced that truth in our own minds, by the free action of our reason, we easily detect it under the symbol. The symbol of the Trinity covers a great truth, a vital truth; but Trinitarians themselves do not see it; Unitarians have not seen it. But as soon as they have felt in themselves the need of that truth, they will discover it. And when they discover it, they will see that they may embrace it without abandoning the views they previously entertained. They will then accept the doctrine of the Trinity, translate it into the language of the reflective reason, show its consistency with the unity of God, and thus lay the foundation for a strict union between them and Trinitarians. The truth of each will be accepted, and a new creed will be formed, better than the old creed of either party, because reconciling and embodying the peculiar views of each. This done, the Orthodox will be obliged to abandon their old symbols, which they will readily consent to do; because they will then see that they may give up their symbols without giving up any idea which they have valued. There will then be new symbols, adapted to the new epoch in the development of truth, and the new religious world will be constituted, and it will be said again, "See how these Christians love one another!"

This is the result to which we look, and for which we strive with what skill and strength we can. We have ceased—we speak personally—to deny, and have commenced an examination, an analysis of all the symbols of the churches, not to reject them, nor even to modify them, but to comprehend them. We already see, or seem to see, the elements of the new

world, and believe we could, had we space and room, even write its Catechism. But enough of this. When Unitarians and Trinitarians become able to understand one another, they will find that they are brothers. And so will it be with all contending sectarians. All that is needed to produce harmony is for each sect to comprehend its own truth, and the truth put forth by every other sect. Each sect has an element of truth. Would we be wise, we must ascertain and accept the elements of each.

ART. VI. — ANCIENT PROFANENESS.

LONGINUS, in his masterly Essay on the Sublime, says : —

“ What, then, did those godlike men perceive, who, disregarding a nicety in all particulars, reached after the loftiest heights of composition ? Among many other things they perceived this, that Nature *decreed* that man should not be an abject or an ignoble animal, but having *conducted* us into life and into the presence of the whole world, as into some vast assembly, in order that we might become spectators of all her works, and strenuous combatants for glory, that she *infused* into our souls an unconquerable love for the eternally great, and in relation to ourselves, the divine. Therefore is it that not even the entire universe suffices for man’s piercing vision and far-reaching fancies, but his Imagination often *transcends* the bounds of that which encompasses him. And if one will comprehensively look around life, which, when viewed in *all* its parts, abounds in the surpassing, grand, and lovely, he will quickly see for what it is that we were born. Thus, by Heaven, *physically* impelled somehow, we do not admire the smaller class of streams, however useful they may be, or clear ; but rather the Nile, the Danube, the Rhine, and, above all, the Ocean. Neither

are we so moved by this flame which we ourselves kindle, because it burns steadily with clear rays, as with the heavenly light, though often they are overshadowed, nor the crater of Ætna, though it pours from its depths rocks whole, and rivers of fire."

The same Longinus, in connexion with Homer, honors the sublimity of the words of the first chapter of Genesis, "God said let there be light, and there was light," and thus characterizes Moses: "The legislator of the Jews, no *casual* man."

The same Longinus wrote thus at Athens, after having, in the spirit of a wise eclectic inquirer, attended the various schools of philosophy then known, at home and abroad.

Lastly, the same Longinus became the minister and friend of Zenobia, renowned for her chastity and heroism, Queen of the East and of Palmyra, who claimed to be sprung from the royal line of Egypt. He taught his mistress Greek, and died in her cause.

Yet this same Longinus is called a *profane* author. Wherefore? Where, in what is called sacred literature, shall we find a passage, which discloses more sound philosophy? The distinction between sacred literature and profane, if we rightly understand it, says nothing in favor of the one or against the other. Sacred literature is that, which was approved by the sacerdotal caste, and laid up as it were in the temple, (*fane*); profane literature was that produced by men out of the sacerdotal caste, and not kept in the temple. Still it might be as good as the sacred, as true, as divine. Moreover, what was profane literature to one nation was sometimes sacred to another. Homer's poems were sacred books to the Greeks, though they are profane to Christians.

Is it not possible, that Christians have inherited too much of Jewish exclusiveness? God undoubtedly spoke to the Jews by the mouth of his prophets; but did he speak to none but Jews; by the mouth of no prophets but Jewish prophets? Were we wise, should we not count all literature sacred, and believe that

God has never left himself without a witness in any nation, nor in any age? We do not overrate Jewish literature, but do we not as Christians underrate the literatures of other ancient nations? We are right in calling Hebrew literature divine; but are we right in withholding the epithet divine from all other literatures? For ourselves, we are inclined to believe with Saint Ambrose, that "truth, by whomsoever uttered, is of the Holy Ghost"; and with Saint Paul, that "all *scripture* is given by the inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." God is no respecter of persons, and he speaks to all ages, to all nations, and to "every man in his own tongue wherein he was born."

LITERARY NOTICES.

Life of Cardinal Cheverus, Archbishop of Bordeaux, formerly Bishop of Boston, Massachusetts. By J. HUEN-DUBOURG. Translated from the French. By E. STEWART. Boston. James Munroe & Co. 1839. 12mo. pp. 389.—This is a very interesting biography of a most excellent minister of the Catholic Church, and we are glad to see it given to our community in an English dress. Cardinal Cheverus is well remembered in this city, and his memory is that which it is always the most grateful to a minister of Jesus to leave behind. If the unanimous testimony of all, who remember his residence in this city, can be relied on, few ministers of religion have ever devoted themselves with more singleness of purpose, benevolence of heart, love of God and of human souls, or with more fidelity to the sacred duties of their profession, than did this worthy man. For ourselves we knew him not, but we have heard him spoken of from our childhood, and never heard him spoken of but with love, respect, and praise.

We are glad to see this biography of an eminent prelate circulate amongst us. It is always well to study the lives of great and good men; the study enlarges our views of human nature, confirms our respect for mankind, and calls forth the better feelings of our hearts, makes us wiser and better. But especially are we pleased to find this biography circulating amongst us, because the subject of it was a prelate of the Catholic Church. We Protestants have many ungenerous prejudices against the Catholic Church; we do not understand that Church, nor do it justice. Nothing could be more out of

character than the hostile feelings which we in this country even now manifest against it. It is, say what we will of it, the original Catholic Church, and to it we are indebted for nearly all the good Christianity has effected. Whatever of religion we Protestants retain, is but a reminiscence of Catholicism. To it we are indebted for the preservation and revival of ancient literature, for the preservation of the Holy Scriptures, and the writings of the Fathers, and for our religious language and works of devotion. Surely, we ought not to condemn it.

The Catholic Church deserves to be honorably mentioned for its democratic influence. Protestantism favors monarchy or aristocracy; Catholicism favors Humanity. Absolute monarchy had no existence in modern Europe until the Protestant movement began; for it was not till then that kings and nobles could feel that there was no organized power on earth above them. The Catholic Church has always shown a tenderness to the poor, and through ages of barbarism and misrule, it was the protector of the humble laborer, the poor and friendless. Its services in this respect, during the long period, in which modern society was in its process of elaboration, should by no means be forgotten.

The Catholic Church has its errors, but the chief of its errors it holds in common with Protestantism. The great error of the Catholic Church is in the fact, that it is founded on the denial of the reason, and the assertion of a positive authority. But Protestants do this to as great a degree as the Catholics, and in a manner altogether more offensive. The difference between the two is well expressed by Guizot: "The Catholic says, Believe, but do not examine; the Protestant says, Examine, but believe as if you had not examined." The Protestant Churches, so far forth as they are churches, are as averse to the exercise of reason as the Catholics. With the Episcopalians, you must bow to the Lords Bishops; with the Presbyterians, to the Lords Presbyters; with the Congregationalists, to the Lords Brethren. Every Protestant Church assumes, in point of fact, precisely the same authority over the mind and the conscience which is claimed by the Catholic Church. And we are free to own, that, if we must submit to authority in matters of belief and conscience, we would much prefer that of the Catholic Church to any other.

Protestantism, so far forth as it is Protestantism, is akin to infidelity, and the resemblance between Luther and Voltaire, in their respective missions, is very great. Voltaire was the complement of Luther. Luther denied the authority of the Pope, and asserted that of the written word. Voltaire was as much offended by the assumed infallibility of a book, as by the assumed infallibility of the Pope, and therefore attacked the book, as Luther had the Pope. In its negative character, Protestantism can never satisfy the religious wants of mankind. In its positive character, it has no advantage over Catholicism. We incline to the Quakers, who are neither Protestants nor Catholics. The Catholic asserts the infallibility of the Church, represented by the Pope; the Protestant asserts the infallibility of the written word, and makes faith dependent on History and Criticism; the Quaker asserts the infallibility of the Spirit of God, a portion of which is given unto every man, and whereof every man is his own interpreter. To this the Christian world must

come at last, and then the Church really universal, the true Catholic Church, will be constituted.

Means and Ends; or Self-Training. Boston. Marsh, Capen, Lyon, and Webb. 1389. — Miss SEDGWICK has here given us a very interesting and a very valuable book, which may be read with profit by grown up people as well as by the the young. We like the spirit which breathes through Miss Sedgwick's works, and we most heartily thank her in the name of our common countrymen for devoting her fine talents to the noble cause of moral and social progress. Few of our popular writers write with a more truly American feeling. She loves democratic institutions, and sympathizes with the people. We indeed are sometimes unable to adopt all her special views, and often regard her notions as somewhat influenced by that social rank, of which she is one of the brightest ornaments. She is not truly democratic; she seems not to have fully comprehended the real evil of existing society, and does not perceive that the remedies she proposes, can at best but partially mitigate it; but she aims well, and the tendency of her writings is in the right direction.

The subject of education in this little volume is treated with much judiciousness. The views taken are in general pleasing and just. Yet we think we discover a tendency to overrate moral and religious education as distinct from intellectual education. This is the besetting sin, not of the age, but of nearly all late popular writers on education. We confess that we mark with grief, and even with some alarm, the almost contemptuous manner in which merely intellectual education is frequently spoken of. The education of the intellect is beginning to be regarded as an insignificant affair. The rage is for what is called the education of the heart. We do by no means think lightly of the education of the heart, and we freely admit, nay, contend, that all education should have a moral and religious direction. But moral and religious education, without a corresponding intellectual education, will do little towards bringing forward that high state of civilization we all earnestly pray for. The cultivation of the sentiments may indeed produce a certain exaltation of character, and give a certain refinement, which it may be desirable to possess; but if not accompanied by a corresponding intellectual development, it will generate a blind zeal for God, a bigotry, an intolerance, a superstition, which of all things are the most destructive to true religion and the welfare of mankind.

The curse of the Dark Ages was not in the exclusive culture of the intellect, but in the all but exclusive culture of the moral and religious sentiments. All those ages, we look back upon with sorrow and shame, were ages of ignorance. Priestcraft, kingcraft, the evils of false systems of ecclesiastical polity, and civil polity, flourish only where the intellect is neglected. Could we realize the kind of education contended for by our popular writers on education, our glorious Republic would soon be no more; for a manly, an energetic civilization, we should have merely a second edition of the Dark Ages, in which the people would be the slaves of the priesthood.

The sentiments are not, after all, so independent of the intellect as it seems to be imagined. They are in themselves blind. Conscience, unenlightened, is an unsafe guide. Its light is borrowed from the intellect. Nor is the cultivation of the intellect so little efficient in promoting virtue as we pretend. The man of enlightened mind, other things being equal, is much the most likely to be a moral and religious man. The habit of quiet and serene study, the earnest pursuit of knowledge, and the steady contemplation of truth, implied in intellectual culture, has a natural tendency to allay the passions, to generate a taste for the morally good, and to prompt efforts in behalf of virtue. In our zeal for moral and religious education, let us be careful, then, not to underrate intellectual culture. It is the truth which sanctifies, and, we may add, the truth which is *known*, for the truth which is not known, is to us as if it were not. It is eternal life to *know* God and Jesus Christ. Moreover, intellectual education has by no means as yet reached that height in this country, which makes it proper for us to neglect it. There is in fact very little intellectual education. There is very little light diffused by our schools. What clear conceptions of duty, of the destiny of man and society, and of the means of promoting individual or social progress, can we find even among the educated portion of our community? Who, that has attempted to discourse to others on great intellectual topics, has not been forcibly struck with the general want of intellectual culture?

These strictures are not designed for Miss Sedgwick, but for what we regard as the rising doctrine on education. We have made these remarks as a warning to our countrymen, to direct the mind to what threatens to be an evil, and which will be one, if not guarded against in season.

Tortosa, the Usurer. A Play. By N. P. WILLIS. New-York. Samuel Colman. 1839. — Mr. Colman has sent this play out in a style which does much credit to his publishing house. The play itself is all that we expected from Mr. Willis. It is as creditable to him as anything we have seen from his pen. It can be read, as we can testify by experience, with ease, and without exhaustion of mind or weariness of the flesh. It is pleasant pastime for an hour, when one has no serious calls upon his time or attention, and when he would be sinning but moderately. Yet in justice we ought to say, that, though creditable to its author, it is not remarkably creditable to the country. It may be pretty, even *nice* poetry, but it is not marked by depth and earnestness of feeling, by true dramatic passion, nor by high and moral aims. The moral of the drama, so far as it has any moral, is that genius has a right to wed the high born; but the low born, if not geniuses, should wed the low born. A very pretty moral for a republican, no doubt! But why waste words upon so insignificant an affair as the author of *Tortosa*? Let him sport on gilded wings his summer day; too soon will come the frost, the killing frost, and no one will dream of asking, "Where is he?"

Dillaway's Latin Classics. 1. M. T. Cicero de Senectute et de Amicitia. Ex editionibus Oliveti et Ernesti. Accedunt notæ Anglicæ juveni accommodatæ. Cura C. K. DILLAWAY, A. M. Bostonæ: Perkins et Marvin. 1837. 2. M. T. Ciceronis Ad Quintum Fratrum Dialogi tres de Oratore. Tom. 1 et 2. Boston. 1838. 3. Pub. Terentii Afri Andria Adelphique. Ex editione Westerhoviana. Boston. 1839. — This is a very neat edition of the Latin classics, and is just such an edition as we have long wanted for our schools. The volumes are of convenient size, and handsomely printed and done up. The notes, which are in English, are brief, comprehensive, and judicious. We commend the edition to the favor of the public.

A Residence in the Sandwich Islands. By C. S. STEWART, U. S. N., late Missionary to the Sandwich Islands. Fifth edition, enlarged, including an Introduction and Notes. By Rev. WILLIAM ELLIS. From the last London edition. Boston. Weeks, Jordan, & Co. 1839. 12mo. pp. 348. — This is a very interesting and instructive book, on an interesting subject, and we welcome a fifth edition of it with much pleasure. Its merits are so well known and appreciated, that we have no occasion to do more than simply announce the publication of a new edition.

Cheveley; or the Man of Honor. By LADY BULWER. — There is much gossip about this book; but we make it a rule to let husband and wife manage their concerns in their own way. It often happens, that both are very worthy people, only they are not exactly fitted one for the other. But that is their affair, and not ours. Lady Bulwer may have written this novel to take off her *sposo*, but we take it as a novel having no sinister intent. As such, we read it and criticise it. As such, it displays eminent talent, great wit, much reading, shrewdness, and admirable graphic power, but no great refinement of feeling or delicacy of taste. One or two of the poetical pieces are very fine, and pleased us much. Upon the whole we think Lady Bulwer, though perhaps a little cross-grained, a woman who is capable of making valuable contributions to our general literature.

Deerbrook. A Novel. By HARRIET MARTINEAU. — The friends of Miss Martineau, we presume, will regret the publication of this novel, which is one of the stupidest in the language. By the bye, we cannot understand the *quasi* popularity which this lady's writings have acquired. She undoubtedly possesses considerable talent, a free spirit, and high moral aims; but her information is exceedingly restricted, and her opinions are remarkable for their crudeness, and incompatibility one with another. She is a thorough-going radical, and so far so good; but she is a furious Malthusian, and that is abominable. She is a liberal Christian, and that is good; but a materialist and necessarian, than which nothing can be worse. She

rejects conventionalism and authority in morals, but denies that there is a universal criterion of Right, and of course that there is any radical distinction between right and wrong. She would raise her sex to the highest social and political rank, and she would deprive man of all manliness of spirit. But enough. Harriet is a bundle of contradictions.

The Tusculan Questions of Marcus Tullius Cicero. Translated by GEORGE ALEXANDER OTIS, Esq. — This translation is not so good as we could wish it, but it is upon the whole quite respectable, and deserves the thanks of the English student. The work itself is above all praise, as one of the most valued and valuable remains of classic antiquity.

Phantasmion: Prince of Palm-land. In two volumes. Colman's Library of Romance. Edited by GRENVILLE MELLEN. New-York. Samuel Colman. 1839. — We have heard this work, by Mrs. Henry Nelson Coleridge, highly spoken of. We have room barely to say, that we have read it with much pleasure. The style is simple, chaste, beautiful, and appropriate. The songs scattered through it, besides their appropriateness as parts of the story, are admirable, and prove the author possesses high poetical powers. It is indeed a Fairy Tale, and for ourselves we like such tales.